

response / reply

SWAMI DAYANANDA SARASWATI
“LIGHT OF TRUTH”
(Satyarth Prakash)

SWAMI DAYANANDA SARASWATI

(on the Qur'an)



In the name of Allāh,
the Beneficent, the Merciful.
Peace and Blessings of Allāh on Mohammad.

DEDICATED TO

Allāh—the Glorious and the High,
Lord of the worlds

AND TO

Mohammad—who brought the world
to our feet and eternity to our arms.

*

SWAMI DAYANANDA SARASWATI
“LIGHT OF TRUTH”
(Satyarth Prakash)

(Followers of Islam are Muslims, not Mohammedans. I have tried to retain the Swami's spelling.)

There are various spellings of the Prophet's name, I prefer 'Mohammad.' In the following presentation the designation 'LOT' refers to Swami Dayananda Saraswati's book *Light Of Truth*.

Quotes from the Rig Veda are taken from Ralph T. H. Griffith, *Hymns Of The RgVeda*, Volumes I and II. First Published in 1889, and Published 1987 by Munshiram Manoharlal, New Delhi. Reference to quotes such as, I. VII. 4-5. Vol. 1, p. 10, indicates that the quote is taken from Book I, Hymn VII, verses 4-5, of Volume 1, page 10).

For those readers who wish to compare the Swami's quotes of the Qur'an with Muhammad Ali's translation and commentary, Muhammad Ali's translation of the Qur'an with text, commentary and notes can be viewed online.

*

If the Veda(s) is Divine revelation it should teach the worship of one God. For Allāh, God, reveals to us that He raised up pro-phets among all people. And that these prophets were given one common message: “And we sent no messenger before thee (Mohammad) but We revealed to him that there is no God but Me, so serve Me”—(Qur'an 21:25)

In his book *Light of Truth* Swami Dayananda has commented on verses of the Qur'an in his attempt to prove the Vedic religion to be the one religion for all "enlightened" mankind. However, Qur'anic verses are quoted out of context, are used without, seemingly, any knowledge as to the background of its revelation, and all verses are interpreted literally without paying any attention to the fact that in the Qur'an "some of its verses are decisive—they are the basis of the Book—and others are allegorical"—(Qur'an 3:6).

Before I take up the Swami's criticisms of the Qur'an—there are 159 criticisms—there are a few statements of the Swami that warrants commenting on:

Soul: Regarding God and the soul, Swami Dayananda says: "In *essence* they are both conscious entities. By *nature* both are pure, immortal and virtuous, etc."; that "the soul acts by virtue of its free will"; and to reincarnate, the soul "Guided by God it enters the body of some living creature with air, water, food, drink or through any one of the openings of the body. Having entered it, it gradually reaches the reproductive element, and thereby establishes itself in the womb, and is thus invested with a body and eventually born. It is clothed with a male or a female body." (LOT, pp. 222, 223, 300, respectively). (*So the souls of the "Gods" Rama and Krishna were in the wombs of their mothers waiting to be covered with semen? If the soul sits in the woman's "womb" where does it sit in the man? his testicles? eunuchs have no testicles. If the soul enters a barren or menopausal woman it might sit in her womb till the woman dies.*)

If the soul has to establish itself in the womb, it is reasonable that it must enter through the mating passage. If it enters through the mouth it will go through the digestive system and pass out the excretionary passage. That this "pure, immortal and virtuous" entity of "free will" and of the same "*essence*" as God, would chart its way down the mouth or genital canal of the female human, beast, bird, or insect and sit in the "womb" waiting to be covered/fertilized by the male seed and to take on flesh, could hardly be the cerebration of "enlightened" mankind.

Like the eggs of a chicken are in a cluster, if more than one soul has to be reincarnated as chicken, one chicken may have more than one soul taking up residency in its womb. The same applies to all other egg-laying creatures—turtles, crocodiles, and frogs; as well as with some animals, such as dogs, cats, pigs, whose litter consists of many. A woman who has multiple births –twin, triplet, and quintuplets– must have two, three, eight souls taking up temporary residency in her womb. And there is the possibility of this soul being aborted instead of being reincar-nated.

If the soul enters the womb of living things "through any one of the openings of the body," as the Swami says, how does the soul enter a plant when it has to be reborn in the vegetable kingdom?

Swami Dayananda states: "He (God) caused the soul to enter the body and He Himself entered the soul thereafter." (LOT, p. 227).

Since the soul is "conscious," "immortal" and embodies God, it must be cognizance of the reality of the existence of God; as such there should not be any atheist. But it is a fact that there are millions, if not hundreds of millions, of atheists. And communist

countries should have small populations of humans and over-flowing with animals, as the atheists, not believing in God, would be reincarnated as sub-humans.

(It is doubtful that this “pure, immortal and virtuous” soul would deny the existence of God [*through freedom of choice*] to be subjected by God into the bodies of sub-humans and to dwell in sewer conditions, for millions of years till it emancipates itself).

Since God enters the soul, and the soul is incarnated as dogs, rats, cats, and pigs, according to the teachings of Hinduism, God eats all the things these animals eat, and dwells in the same conditions as these animals dwell. (?)

It is also said that the soul does not remember its past life—(Gita 4:5). How can the soul not remember its past life when God is inside the soul, and God is Omniscient?

Whereas the Bible and the Qur'an teach that only one couple (Adam and Eve) was created in the beginning, the Swami says that God created more “than one” man. He quotes the Yajur Veda: “(In the beginning) there were born many men as well as *rishis*, i.e. learned seers of nature. They were progenitors of the human race”. To which he comments, “On the authority of this *Vedic* text it is certain then that in the beginning of Creation hundreds and thousands of men were born. By observing nature with the aid of reason we come to the same conclusion, *viz.*, that men are descended from many fathers and mothers (i.e., not from one father and one mother)”—(LOT, p. 263).

(Meaning the differences in colors and features, etc; show that we came from different couples, as compared to us coming from one couple wherein we all would be of the same complexion and feature etc. But this would seem to say that God made some people white, some brown, black etc; which may cause enmity; and the cynics may charge that God was biased. But God creating one couple, and man undergoing bodily appearances due to his own domicile, God could not be charged with being biased. And many animals would have to be killed for God to provide these thousands of couples with “coats of skins”).

If God created many couples, and in different regions of the earth, those couples in the Frigid zones –having no clothes, no implements of agriculture, no house, no fire, and prohibited from killing animals for food and skin for clothing– must have frozen and starved. They would only have caves to shelter them, and perhaps frozen fruits/berries/vegetables for food. Those assigned to Torrid regions with desert conditions must have been sun-burned, starved, and parched from thirst. These would only have sand dunes and caves for shelter, and dates, perhaps, and insects for food.

However, it may be argued that God would not have subjected this creation to such harsh conditions. This, seemingly, would be true. But if these couples were not in separate regions and were in proximity of each other or dwelt together, there would be the argument that there were these thousands of naked people of different colors and features exposed to one another; which would have seemed like a nudist colony. And physically, the men and women must be, respectively, the same, if not, one party might be envious of the other who is finely endowed.

The descendants of one couple (Adam and Eve) could have dispersed throughout the earth, as the land mass of the earth are mostly connected or separated at their shortest point by about 1,500 miles—this is not incredible, given the accomplishments of the Aztecs, Incas, Egyptians and Phoenicians. Solomon navigated the seas 2,300 years ago; before him Noah built an Ark. Sailing seems to be as old as recorded history.

That God created thousands of men at the beginning contradicts with the Gita that Manu is “the father of mankind”–(Gita 4:1).

The Swami says: “One billion, nine hundred and sixty millions and some hundred thousand years have passed since the creation of the world and the revelation of the *Vedas*.” (LOT, p. 267).

Since the *Vedas* is as old as the creation of the earth, it stands to reason that humans were also present this nearly two billion years ago, for if there were no people there would be no need for the *Vedas*.

Assuming God created one thousand couples—to take a conservative amount from the Swami’s “hundreds and thousands of men” that “were born”—and that each couple has a life-span of sixty years, and that each couple and each successive couple produces seven children (compared to ten enjoined by Hinduism, explained later), there would be more than six billion people in the world today. (*The scholars of mathematics, using exponential calculation, would be able to give us a fairly accurate number of people that would be on the earth*).

Even if we take one couple as being on the earth for this nearly two billion years, and using the same figures (a life-span of sixty years, and that each couple and each successive couple produces seven children) there would be more than six billion people in the world today.

While the earth may be billions of years old, it is not necessary that God created man soon after the creation of the world. It may have taken millions of years for the earth to cool and become habitable—for the creation of vegetation and other forms of animal life.

Karma/Reincarnation: The claim that the Vedic religion is the only religion for “enlightened” mankind and that karma and reincarnation are truths is a baseless claim. No one seems to know the origin for these doctrines: “The origin and the development of the belief in the transmigration of souls are very obscure...This doctrine of *samsara* (reincarnation) is attributed to the sage Uddalaka Aruni, who is said to have learned it from a Ksatriya chief. In the same text, the doctrine of *karma* (works)...also occurs for the first time, attributed to Yajnavalkya. Both doctrines appear to have been new and strange ones, circulating among small groups of ascetics who were disinclined to make them public.” (*Ency. Brit*; 15th Ed; Vol. 8, p. 911. Underlines added)

And Anoop Chandola states: “Through contact, the Aryans and non-Aryans began to modify and integrate each other’s path-ways. In the context of religion, for example, the Austro-Asiatics may have contributed the belief in each life passing to another life. This belief later, in the form of reincarnation, became a major element in the *Upanishads*.” (*The Way To True Worship*, p. 8).

If karma and reincarnation were Divine bequeath it could not be speculated to have been “contributed” by the “Austro-Asiatics.” Neither would the ascetics be “disinclined to make them public.”

In believing that his suffering is the result of his actions in a past life, man “is thus induced to reconcile himself to social cruelty, exploitation and oppression,” wrote V.M. Tarkunde. (*Radical Humanism*, p. 69).

It is incredible that only Africans and Hindus and Bangladeshis seem to have the worst *karma*, considering that these are the nations/people that suffers the most of famine, flood, and poverty; even though they engage in little or no war or aggression or oppression or exploitation of others; and are probably more religious.

If suffering is the result of bad karma, no attempt should be made to alleviate the miserable conditions of the sufferers and the poor—those who try to improve the lot of the poor and the suffering would be working against karma. If their conditions can be improved, karma is meaningless—seeing that it can be subverted/defeated. If karma can be annulled, man can change the natural law of God. If man can change the natural law of God, man would be greater than God. But man could never be greater than God.

Also the need for higher education would be pointless. (Perhaps lower caste Hindus should be schooled to see how many are poor or illiterate because of karma).

Karma and *reincarnation* are cardinal doctrines of the Hindu faith. And, as they delineate between heaven and hell cardinal doctrines are to be clearly expressed: they are not to be left to the function of interpretation.

Jawaharlal Nehru points out in his book *The Discovery Of India*: “The early Vedic Aryanspaid little attention to the soul. In a vague way they believed in some kind of existence after death.” (p. 79).

If these Vedic Aryans were followers of the Vedas they could not have in a “vague way” believed in “some kind” of existence after death if the Vedas expressly taught the doctrines of *karma* and *reincarnation*.

It is incredible that God would give man an “eternal” path to follow without a clearly charted map.

Swami Dayananda states: “If you refuse to believe in the pre-existence of the soul, how do you think it to be consistent with the justice of God to bless some with riches, power, and talent, etc., while afflict others with poverty, suffering, idiocy and the like without their having done anything—good or evil—in their previous lives to deserve them?”—(LOT, pp. 296-297).

If people are given wealth and poverty because of karma then the souls that are given wealth should not become poor; and the souls that are given poverty should not become wealthy; as sometimes happen in society.

The atheists who are born with power, wealth, and talent, it is rather strange that God “bless” with these them when they do not believe in Him. The drug dealers and the pimps, if God “bless” these persons they should not be criminalized. And if the victim(s) of a sadist suffers because of deeds in a past life, the sadist is not to be prosecuted. And the masochist who punishes himself must have punished himself in a past life.

If karma is the law of God, and if people are born wealthy or poor according to this law of God, and since the wealthy can be reduced to penury and the poor can be elevated to affluence, this shows that karma can be compromised. If this natural law of God – karma—can be annulled it would mean that man can change the natural law of God. If man can change the natural law of God man would be greater than God. But man is not greater than God. Therefore, either karma is a myth, or God is. But God is not a myth.

If souls come from previous births, and as there are more births than deaths—the number of people on earth has increased to more than six billion and it is expected to double again sometime in the future—where do these extra souls come from? If God keeps on making souls (on a daily basis?) to accommodate these new bodies, He could not be said to be Omniscient, not knowing how many souls He will be sending to earth. And if He has already made all the souls that He would send to earth, how many souls did He make? And with cloning in vogue, from where do all these souls (for the clones) come?

The Swami says “When sin predominates over virtue in a man, his soul goes into the bodies of lower animals and the like when virtue predominates over sin in a soul, it is born as a good and learned person. When sin and virtue are equal, the soul is born as an ordinary man”—(LOT, p. 299).

But it is rather strange that these souls whose “virtue predominates over sin” and become “learned” are non-Hindus—considering that Christians (of America) are the intellectual giants in matters of science, technology, and medicine etc; and that Muslims were the rulers of the world in the early part of our era; even the atheists (of the USSR) were way ahead of the Vedic souls. One would expect that God would have reincarnated such virtuous souls into the bodies of Hindus—the believers in His Veda(s).

How is it that God reincarnates those souls that are deserving of human bodies into atheists? If He does so unknowing that they would become atheists, He is not Omniscient.

Hindus are also divided as to whether man is reincarnated into various kingdoms or as one type of creature only:

“The Vedas explain that the soul... may inhabit any of 8,400,000 general species of material bodies. ...beginning with the primitive microbes and amoebas, continuing on through the aquatic, plant, insect, reptile, bird, and animal species, and culminating in human beings and demigods.” (*The Higher Taste*, pub. International Society for Krishna Consciousness, pp. 38, 39).

But the sage, Uddalaka Aruni, is said to have taught his son: “Whatever these creatures are here, whether a lion, or a wolf, or a boar, or a worm, or a midge, or a gnat, or a mosquito, **that they become again and again.**” (Meaning that they do not reincarnate into other kinds of animals). (Lin Yutang, *Wisdom of India*, p. 30. Italics/emphasis added).

Hindus are also divided over the method of one freeing himself from this cycle of deaths and rebirths known as *Moksha*: “The methods by which release is sought after and attained differ from school to school”—(*Ency. Brit.* Vol. VI, 15th Edn; p. 972).

If karma and reincarnation were clearly expressed doctrines in the Veda(s), it would be expected that the method of attaining *Moksha* should not “differ from school to school.” It should be the same.

Swami Dayananda notes from the teaching of Hinduism: “Should a wife out of her family pride desert her husband and misconduct herself, let the king condemn her to be

devoured by dogs before all men and women” and “Similarly should a hus-band forsake his wife and misconduct himself with other women, let the king cause that sinner to be burnt alive publicly on a red hot iron-bed.” (LOT, p.199).

And The International Society for Krishna Consciousness states in its book *The Higher Taste* (p. 38) that “the law of *karma*operates impartially and unerringly, awarding us exactly what we deserve.”

Since karma is “awarding us exactly what we deserve” such a wife and husband (as in the above discussion) should not be subjected to human punishments, seeing that their actions were dictated by karma—they, in a past life had done the same things to each other for karma to now have the roles reversed.

Since karma is “awarding us exactly what we deserve,” there is no need for the Vedas. As we would not be able to circumvent karma.

(Incidentally, it is more barbaric to slaughter animals for food than to feed women to “dogs”?)

If God gives man sub-human bodies as punishment in judgment, man is keeping Him busy with his cloning, grafting of new plants, and crossbreeding of new animals for Him to assign errant souls into.

The forest fires that ravage North America and elsewhere, the souls that inhabit this multitude of trees, were their terms of kar-mic reaction expired for them to be razed or did they suffer pre-mature death?

Karma—law of action and equal reaction—is for science. Along with his right to retaliate, man is endowed with reason and to be merciful and forgiving. The God Who gives to all human action an equal and opposite reaction is devoid of mercy: there is no room in Him for forgiveness. If karma/reincarnation were Divine truths, trying to improve the conditions of the unfortunate—which is the “reaction” to their bad karma—would be to work against karma; if such works are successful man would have subverted karma. Whereas in earlier times India’s “intellectual inquiry and philosophical development” was “comparable” to the Greeks, as V.M. Tarkunde notes:

“By the 8th century A.D., however, the school of thought which came to prevail in the country was the other-worldly Vedant philosophy. It regarded physical existence to be an illusion, the human body to be the prison-house of the soul, and escape from the cycle of births and deaths to be the highest human ideal. Self-denial, abstinence, celibacy, desirelessness and meditation became the highest virtues. The best spirits being thus pre-occupied in other-worldly pursuits, the rest of the society came easily under the domination of ambitious princes and self-seeking priests. The theory of Karma, which says that our sufferings in the present life are the result of the sins committed by us in our previous lives, reconciled the poor to their miserable lot and consolidated the prevailing caste system and the barbaric custom of un-touchability.” (*Radical Humanism*, pp. 10-11).

Abdul Haque Vidyarthi has pointed out in his monumental work *Muhammad in World Scriptures*, Vol. 1 (p. 6): “No scripture of any religion was to be found in its

original form and pristine purity at the time of the Holy Prophet's (Mohammad) advent, nor is one found today. Such books, therefore, cannot prove the truth of religion."

The religion that cannot prove the "pristine purity" of its text and the clear basis for the articles of its faith could not be the religion for "enlightened" mankind.

On page 690 of his book, the Swami quotes the Qur'an which says that for Muslims there will be Paradise "under whose shades shall rivers flow: decked shall they be therein with bracelets of gold, and green robes of silk and rich brocade shall they wear, reclining them therein on thrones. Blissful the reward! and a pleasant couch!"—(Qur'an 18:31).

The Swami has given this verse a literal meaning, ignoring or ignorant of the fact that Allāh, God says "So no soul knows what refreshment of the eyes is hidden for them: a reward for what they did"—(Qur'an 32:17). The Prophet Mohammad is reported to have said: Allāh says, I have prepared for My righteous servants that which no eye has seen and no ear has heard, and which the heart of man cannot conceive—(Bokhari Vol.'s 4:467; 6:302-303; 9:589)

Man can relate to things only in the physical life. To us the ultimate in possessions are gold and precious stones, wealth and carnal pleasure. So Allah relates to us in terms of what we understand. These descriptions of paradise are to let us know that we will receive in paradise the ultimate in bliss. This reward is not a lure for us to do good and to avoid evil, but rather the fruits of our own labor that we have toiled for in this life.

To the above noted verse the Swami comments: "Indeed! What a fine place is the paradise described in the Quran! It has gardens, ornaments, clothes, cushions, pillows for affording pleasure to those who live therein. A wise man will, on reflection, find that the Mohammedan paradise excels in nothing except injustice which lies in the fact that the soul will have infinite enjoyment or infinite suffering for actions which are finite. Besides, infinite happiness will appear to them infinite misery, even as if a person goes on eating sweet things for a long time, they begin to taste like poison to him. Therefore, the belief that the soul is reborn after having received the bliss of salvation till the Grand Dissolution (of the universe) alone constitutes the true doctrine." (*Meaning that belief in karma and reincarnation is the true belief*).

There is no infinite suffering in Hell, as noted in "HELL." If the Muslim Paradise has ornate furnishings for its righteous, what does the Hindu heaven has for those who attain the heavenly planets—those who are freed through *moksa*? (*Dealt with later*).

If the luxuries of paradise will become "infinite misery" what will constant deaths and rebirths become when one is returned as worms to feast on sewage and on decayed corpses –human and animals; as cockroaches to be reviled and smashed; as maggots and as flies to feed on sores and wounds; as cats, dogs, and swine and vultures to live in filth, to feed on filth, to forage in sewer and to scavenge on carcasses? Such living could hardly be blissful for the human soul.

Let the "wise man" and woman reflect which of the two he/she would have—the ignominious rebirth of (the mythical) karma and reincarnation, or Paradise's "infinite misery" of gardens and delight?

The Bhagavad Gita speaks of hell—(*Bhagavad-Gita As It Is*, 1:43; 16:16, 21. See p. 193). The Rig Veda also speaks of hell:

"They who are full of sin, untrue, unfaithful,

they have engendered this abysmal station.”
 (“*This abysmal station*: that is, says Sayana,
narakasthanam or hell. The wicked are the cause of the existence of the place of
punishment prepared for them”).

(IV. V. 5, note # 5. Vol. 1, pp. 427, 428)
“The friends have sung in unison, the prudent wish
to sacrifice: Down sink the unintelligent.”
 (“*Down sink*: *narake*, into hell, says Sayana.”)
(IX. LXIV. 21, note # 21, Vol. 2, pp. 338, 339).

If man is punished by being reduced to taking births in lower forms—animals, birds, insects, etc –according to his deeds, there is no need for hell—a “place of punishment.” If there was no hell in Hinduism, it is doubtful that reference would be made to it. To have *hell* and *karma/reincarnation* seems to be a contradiction.

Caste: The Rig Veda (I. VII. 9. Vol. 1, p. 10) says, “Indra who rules with single sway
men, riches, and the fivefold race, Of those who dwell upon the earth.”

There is a difference of opinion as to the identity of the “five-fold race” spoken of in the verse. Whether it is the whole world or the five “Aryan settlements or tribes only” or the four castes. “But there were no such distinctions of caste when the hymn was composed.” –(Griffith).

However, such caste designation could have been revealed/ composed at a later date. As Griffith noted, the above Hymn was “composed.” By who was it composed? If it was human composition, this would seem to negate the claim that the Veda (or at least part of it) is Divine Revelation. According to *Britannica* (noted further on), hymns were composed by “bard-priest”, of which the best of these “poems” were compiled into “an anthology called Rgveda.”

According to the Bhagavad Gita man is born into either of four castes: “Brahmans, ksatriyas, vaisyas and sudras are distinguish-ed by the qualities born of their own natures in accordance with the material modes” –(Bhagavad Gita, As It Is, 18:41-44).

Whereas Brahmans and ksatriyas are considered the higher of the two castes, women, vaisyas, and sudras are said to be of the lower castes or “lower births”: Krishna says:

“those who take shelter in Me, though they be
of lower birth—women, vaisyas [merchants]
and sudras [workers]—
can attain the supreme destination.”
(Bhagavad Gita As It Is, 9:32)

The Rig Veda also says that man is born into castes:

“When they divided Purusa how
many portions did they make?
What do they call his mouth, his arms?
What do they call his thighs and feet?
The Brahman was his mouth,
of both his arms was the Rajanya made.
His thighs became the Vaisya,
from his feet the Sudra

was produced.”
(X. XC. 11-12. Vol. 2, p. 559):

It is true that a person can increase intellectually or regress regardless of the mental status of his/her parents. If these division of castes were one of merit and not of class, women could not be categorized as being of “lower birth,” as the Gita teaches.

Islam teaches that man is born a Muslim –i.e. in the nature to serve Allāh God– with the potential to rise to the highest or to degrade himself to the lowest; and judges man only by his belief in Allah God and his deeds.

God/Veda: The difference in Hindu beliefs in the matter of God is markedly pronounced where Krishna is revered in the Bhagavad Gita. However, The Gita, “**Being opposed to the Veda, it cannot be held to be an authority. ... Krishna could never be God,**” states the Swami–(LOT, p. 219).

But the worshippers of Krishna could use the counter argument to the effect that the Veda being “opposed” to the Gita, “it can-not be held to be an authority.” Even though the *Veda* is said to be more than 1.9 billion years old, age is no guarantee of know-ledge or authenticity.

Again, part of Hinduism teaches that God (Vishnu) incarnates Himself as man and beast. In answer to the question, “Does God incarnate or not?” The Swami states: “No; because it is said in the Yajur Veda, “He is unborn.” He...is never born and never takes on a human form.”” LOT, p. 219).

The religion of such a contrasting view of its Godhead cannot be the religion of “enlightened” mankind.

The Swami wrote: “Had He (God) revealed the *Veda* in the language of some particular country, He would have been partial to that country, because it would have been easier for the people of that country to learn and teach the *Veda* than for the foreign-ers, therefore, it is that He did it in *Sanskrit* that belongs to no country, and is the mother of all other languages.”(LOT, p. 237).

(One would expect that God would want his message to be easy for people to learn and understand; and to teach it to others, since it is for all man, as is claimed. Incidentally, how many Hindus are there who know the *Veda* from memory? There are thousands of Muslims who know the Qur'an from memory).

Compare the Vedas being revealed in a language that no one knows to Allāh, God, giving revelations to all people in their own language, so that their messengers “might explain to them clearly”–(Qur'an 14:4).

The Swami notes (and it is worthwhile to point out that the following first two statements are not those of the *Veda*, but of the Shatpatha Brahman, XI, 4, 2, 3; and Manu 1,-23, respect-ively): “In the beginning, God revealed the four *Vedas*, *Rig*, *Yajur*, *Sama* and *Atharva*, to *Agni*, *Vayu*, *A'ditya* and *Angira*, respectively.” That “*Brahma* learnt the four *Vedas*” from these four men who “Among all men those four alone were purest in heart.” And that the age of the *Vedas*, since it was revealed is “One billion, nine hundred and sixty millions and some hundred thousand years.” (LOT, pp. 236; 237; 267, respectively).

(If the Rig Veda is of pristine purity it could not have been revealed to Agni, or to Agni only, when it is said that the Rig Veda consists of hymns composed by “bard-priest.” Details further on).

Here we have a God, Brahma, who is said to be the Creator, learning books from men. Also if these men (Gods?) had taught the Veda to men, there should not be difference in beliefs in Hinduism’s cardinal doctrine of reincarnation –as to whether beings return as different creatures or as the same type of creature again and again. Neither should there be a difference in beliefs as to whether God incarnates Himself or not.

Secondly, here we have a book almost two billion years old, transmitted orally – papyrus came into use only around 3500 BC; and paper was not invented till about 105 AD in China– and in a language that belongs to no one. Is there any wonder it is not in its “pristine purity”?

If God revealed the Veda only to the Hindus (of India), this itself shows that God was “partial” to India/Hindus; for people would have to go to India to learn Sanskrit. (It is yet to be known that Swamis went to Arabia or Palestine or Zimbabwe or Russia or Chile to teach the natives Sanskrit).

The Rig Veda says: “Agni thou madest heaven to thunder for mankind: thou, yet more pious, for pious Pururavas.” –(I. XXXI. 4. Vol. 1, p. 43). The explanation to this verse says that *Puru-ravas* is the “son of Budha. He is said to have instituted the three sacrificial fires. Agni, to reward him, sent thunder the forerunner of rain.” –Griffith.

If this *Pururavas* is the son of the famous religious personality, Buddha, the Veda could not have been revealed nearly two billion years ago, because Buddha’s term was from 563BC–483BC–his son was not in “the beginning”: *Pururavas* could not have been at the beginning, when his father existed around 563BC–483BC. Either this Budha of the Vedic verse is not the famous Buddhist, Buddha, or the Veda is not all Divine Revela-tion: not of “pristine purity.”

If thunder came only because of *Pururavas*, around 563BC–483BC, this would mean that there was no thunder in “the beginning”: for at least one billion years.

Interestingly, the Swami claims that God revealed the Vedas to four individuals in a language that was not the mother tongue of any. But Anoop Chandola says: “The Indo-European people who began to enter the Indian subcontinent,” their “language, rich in oral literature, was called Sanskrit,” and that “the Aryan priests collected the oral verse in a book known as the *Rig Veda*. Each of the ten volumes, probably completed over several hundred years,” and that, “Three more Vedas were added: *Yajur Veda*, *Sama Veda*, and *Atharva Veda*. The Vedas are called *shrutis*; that is, they were heard as heard by others through oral transmission.” –(*The Way To True Worship*, pp. 7, 9).

If the Rig Veda was revealed by God, and God had stated clearly in the Rig Veda that He revealed the Rig Veda, as well as the other three Vedas, to these four men—*Agni*, *Vayu*, *A'ditya* and *Angira*, respectively—it is doubtful that it could be said that the Rig Veda was “collected” from the “oral literature” of the “Indo-European people who began to enter the Indian subcontinent.” And that “Three more Vedas were added: *Yajur Veda*, *Sama Veda*, and *Atharva Veda*.”

The Swami quotes the Rig Veda (I, 164, 39) as saying, “they alone enjoy *eternal bliss* who study the *Vedas*, live a righteous life, become perfect *yogis* and realize God.” (LOT, p. 72).

Contrastingly, the Qur'an teaches that Allāh, God, gave guidance to all nations: thus people, men and women, of all nations who follow their respective prophet will achieve "eternal bliss."

If the Veda(s) is the only Divine Book, there must be a God other than the God of Hinduism/Vedism, because the Qur'an has information which no man could have known.

The Swami says, "God has names in all the three genders;" and that God has "millions" of names—(pp. 14, 17, resp.)

(In Islam Allāh, God, is known by one hundred names; and only in masculine gender).

In support of the claim that Hinduism/Vedism teaches only Monotheism, the Swami notes: "The word *Devata* is erroneously translated into god by the orthodox *Pandits* and European scholars." Generally anything or anyone, including God, who gives enlightenment is said to be a *devata*. (p. 203, *footnote*).

However, Jawaharlal Nehru says (about the Vedas) "Gradually the conception of God grows: there are the Olympian type of gods, and then monotheism, and later, rather mixed with it, the conception of monism." And that "There is in the Mahabharata the ***polytheism of the Vedas***, the monism of the Upanishads, and deisms, and dualisms, and monotheism."

(Please note the words: "polytheism of the Vedas" which is italicized and emphasized).

Britannica notes:

"An important aspect of Aryan religious life was the bard-priest who composed hymns in praise of gods, to be sung or chanted at sacrifices. ...By about 1000 BC this body of chanted poetry had apparently grown to unmanageable proportions, and the best of the poems were formed into an anthology called Rgveda, which was then canonized.—(15th Edn; Vol. 17, p. 151).

In contrast to the Swami's claim, there are several statements of the Rig Veda that speak of Polytheism—Gods and Goddesses:

"The two Invokers I invite, the wise,
 divine and sweet of tongue,
To celebrate this our sacrifice.
 Ila, Sarasvati, Mahi,
three Goddesses who bring delight"
(I. XIII. 8-9. Vol. 1, p. 17).

(It "seems uncertain" *who these two Invokers are*, "whether Agni and Aditya, or Agni and Varuna, or Varuna and Aditya"—(Note # 8).

(Agni, Aditya and Varuna are names of God, but these "two Invokers" are objects. If Saraswati is the feminine name of God, she could not be a Goddess—names are not objects. "Delight" could not be brought by three Goddesses, when it is claimed that there is only One God).

"Indrani, Varunani, and

Agnayi hither I invite”
(I. XXII. 12. Vol. 1. p. 28)

(The note says: “*Indrani, Varunani and Agnayi*: are respectively the consorts of Indra, Varuna, and Agni”).

(If God is One with “millions” of names only, it would seem that each name, or at least some, has its own consort. Why would God, being Omnipotent, Omniscient, and Omnipresent need a consort?)

“Glory to Gods, the mighty and the lesser,
glory to Gods the younger and the elder!
Let us, if we have power, pay the Gods worship:
no better prayer than this, ye Gods, acknowledge.”

(I. XXVII. 13. Vol. 1, p. 38).

(The note to this verse says: These distinctions of greater and lesser, older and younger Gods, or as we should say, angels, are nowhere further explained. Sunahsepa, it is said, by the advice of Agni, worships the Visvedevas or the Universal Gods. The Visvedevas, as a separate troop or class of Gods, are ten in number, especially worshipped at funeral obsequies, and moreover, according to the laws of Manu, entitled to daily offerings). ”

“Agni whom daily Varuna and Mitra the
Gods bring thrice a day to this our worship.”

(III. IV. 2. Vol. 1, p. 341)

(If Agni Varuna and Mitra are the names only of the One God, Varuna and Mitra cannot bring Agni, when Agni is only a name).

“May Bharati with all her Sisters,
Ila accordant with the Gods,
with mortals Agni,
Sarasvati with all her kindred Rivers,
....Three Goddesses....”

(III. IV. 8; Vol. 1, p. 341).

(The note to this verse says: “*Bharati, Ila, and Sarasvati* are Goddesses presiding over different department of religious worship. See I.13.9”).

(If there is one God, why the need for Goddesses to preside over different department of worship? Again, if Sarasvati is only a feminine name of God, how could she be a Goddess—names are not objects).

“So Agni, kindled mid this adoration,
invite thou Mitra, Varuna, and Indra.”

(VII. XCIII. 7. Vol. 2, p. 97)

(If there was One God and these others were names only of God, Agni could not be asked to invite Mitra, Varuna, and Indra—names are not objects).

“O Gods,
And thee too, O great Aditi,
thee also, Goddess, I address,
(VIII. LVI. 9-10. Vol. 2, p. 225).

(Clearly, this prayer is not addressed to One God).

(There are legions of verses that speak of “Gods” and “Immortals.” While some may be taken to be angels, it is not reasonable that people should call humans and angels “Gods,” and when only the One God can give provisions).

If the four personages—*Agni*, *Vayu*, *A'ditya* and *Angira*—to whom God is said to have revealed the four Vedas nearly two billion years ago had explained the Vedas clearly to Hindus, it is doubtful that there would have been, among the Hindus, “as many as sixty-three confusing schools of philosophy at the time of Buddha (563-483 B.C.),” in which *karma* and *reincarnation* likely were among the topics of discussion:

“The Sankhya philosophers believed that the world consists of two principles, souls and the material world, the *Prakriti*, or Nature, while the Vedanta philosophers believed in one all-comprising unity. Out of such debates in the forest grew these books.”

“...the final consummation of Vedic philosophy is to be found in *Bhagavad-Gita*, written perhaps two centuries later, when an ardent devotion to a personal God took the place of these barren speculations. According to Buddhist records, there were as many as sixty-three confusing schools of philosophy at the time of Buddha (563-483 B.C.), which explained Buddha’s revolt at their futile reasonings and ritualism.” (Lin Yutang, *Wisdom of India*, pp. 24, 25).

Jawaharlal Nehru wrote in his *The Discovery of India*:

“The early Vedic Aryanspaid little attention to the soul. In a vague way they believed in some kind of existence after death. Gradually the conception of God grows: there are the Olympian type of gods, and then monotheism, and later, rather mixed with it, the conception of monism.”

That “foreign elements” brought their customs into India. And:

“Many of these customs were unlike those of the Aryans, and so a curious mixture of opposing ideas and customs is observable....Gradually the absorption of the earlier indigenous elements as well as of newcomers was taking place, and ***the Vedic religion was being modified accordingly. It was beginning to take that all-inclusive form which led to modern Hinduism.***”(pp. 79, 106-107, resp. Italics/emphasis, added).

The Vedic religion cannot be the religion for “enlightened” mankind when Hindus are worshipping “*gramadevatas*,” Shiva, Vishnu or Kali.

The Vedic religion cannot be the religion for “enlightened” mankind when the Hindu God, Vishnu, was “a minor solar deity in the Rgveda, who later became one of the most important and popular divinities of Hinduism”, as noted by *Britannica*. It is doubtful that “enlightened” mankind would accept that God increases in stature or status.

Whether the Vedas is two years old or two billion years old is of no consequence. It is not the antiquity of the Vedas that is of importance, but its source and doctrines.

The above entry is enough to show that the claim that Hinduism/Vedism is the religion for “enlightened” mankind is a myth.

Unlike Hinduism which cannot show the clear basis of its Articles of Faith—*karma and reincarnation and pure Monotheism*—Islam can show the clear basis of its Articles of Faith—Monotheism, Prayer, Charity, Fasting, and Hajj—and even clear expressions for the Resurrection and Day of Judgment and Paradise and Hell.

*

Let us examine the Swami's criticism of the Qur'an. The Qur'anic translation noted **are entries by the Swami**, which “translation was rendered into *Bhasha* and transcribed in Devanagari character”–(LOT, p. 649). As the numbering system of the *Bhasha*'s translation differs with Muhammad Ali's, for ease of identification for those who may wish to check these quotes, I have replaced the verse *numbers* of this *Bhasha*'s translation to that of Muhammad Ali's translation. I would suggest that readers consult Muhammad Ali's translation, as there are discrepancies in certain words of the *Bhasha* translation. Muhammad Ali's translation of the Qur'an can be viewed online: www.muslim.org

The Swami's material is cumbersome; as such not all of his comments are repeated; the responses given should be clear enough to give an indication of the Swami's comments. For example, in item # 5, the Swami quotes Qur'an chapter 2:1-6

“There is no doubt in this book; it is a direction to the pious
who believed in the mysteries of *faith*, who observe the appointed times of prayer,
and distribute *alms* out of what we have bestowed on them;
and who believed in that revelation, which hath been sent down unto thee,
and that which hath been sent down *unto the prophets* before thee,
and have firm assurance in the life to come: these are directed by their Lord and
they shall prosper. As for the unbelievers it will be equal to
them whether thou admonish them, or do not admonish them;
they will not believe—God hath sealed up their hearts and their hearing;
a dimness covereth their sight and they shall suffer a grievous punishment”

To which the Swami comments: “Is it not arrogance on the part of God to praise His own book? The revelation of the Quran is of no use, since the pious are already treading the right path without extrinsic aid, while the wicked are not directed by it. Does God provide (the Mohammedans) with the necessary cash to defray all their expenses out of His own treasury without any exertion on their part or paying heed to their merits and demerits? If He does, why does He not do the same for all, and why do the Mohammedans then work at all? If it is permissible to have faith also in the Bible, why do not the Mohammedans believe in that book in the same way as they do in the Quran? But if they do, where is then the necessity for the Quran to be revealed? If it be argued that the Quran is more comprehensive than the Bible, it might be asked if God had forgotten to write anything in the latter book. If He had not, it was useless for Him to reveal the Quran. Besides we find that the Bible and the Quran differ so little, in other words, they are at one with each other in most things, it is, therefore, reasonable to ask

why the revelation was not sent down (once for all) in one (complete) book such as the *Veda*?

Should one believe in the last day alone? Are the Christians and the Mohammedans alone directed by the Lord? Are there no sinners among them? Should even the unrighteous among the Mohammedans and the Christians prosper, but not even the righteous among others? Does it not show want of justice and equity in God? Is it not an *ex parte* decree to call those, who do not profess to believe in the Islam, *Infidels*? If God hath sealed their hearts and their hearing and this leads them to commit sin, they are not to blame. The fault lies at the door of God Himself. This being the case, why should some suffer while others enjoy happiness?

Thus the human soul cannot be held responsible for its sinful or virtuous deeds since it cannot be said to be a free agent.” (LOT, pp. 653-654).

Allah praising His own Book: Allāh, God did not “praise His own book.” Since man’s knowledge in physical things is limited, and in unknown things is negative, Allāh, being the Omniscient is assuring man that whatever He has revealed in His Qur’ān is the truth “There is no doubt” in it! Those who accept His Words and practices His commands of prayer, charity, etc, are on the path of righteousness and success, and believe in the rewards of the next life.

Those who are dedicated to disbelief, would not respond to the doctrines of the Qur’ān, and thus cannot benefit from the preaching of the Prophet.

Allah providing cash: As explained, Allah God created the heavens and the earth and all for the use of man. These fruits can only be reaped through the acquisition of knowledge and striving. The religionist(s) who sit in his shrine will not have, but the atheist who tends the field and the flocks will have. Muslims who are fortunate are required to share their fortune with the poor and the needy.

The Infidel: As noted, Islam accepts that all Divinely inspired religions have righteous people. Followers of their respective prophets will receive bliss; whereas the wicked will suffer. Islam is not only belief in the Hereafter. Islam is of both belief and practice.

Since a disbeliever is a person who does not share the belief of another person; anyone outside a person’s circle of belief can be called a disbeliever, e.g. to a Christian the Muslims and Hindus etc, are the disbelievers; to the Hindus the Muslims and Christians etc, are the disbelievers.

In fact Hinduism also refers to others as “infidel.” The Swami quotes *Manu* as saying, “He is an **infidel** who is a reviler and disbeliever of the *Veda*.”—(LOT, p. 78).

Allāh sealing the hearts and hearings. Since Allāh has created all men sinless, and instructed us to be upright in religion, and, equally important, that there is no altering his creation and has given man a free choice, He cannot be said to have created some men with sealed hearts and ears and eyes.

This sealing of the faculties, as noted in the verse, are expressly, the faculties of those who are heedless of the call of the Prophet. They are the ones who are the cause of their faculties being sealed. Much as a covetous person increases in envy at the increasing wealth of his neighbor, the stubbornness of the sinners increases at the continuing preaching of the Prophet, and the increasing success of Islam.

Elsewhere it is said, “...they have hearts wherewith they understand not, and they have eyes wherewith they see not, and they have ears wherewith they hear not. They are

as cattle; nay they are more astray. They are the heedless ones”–(Qur'an 7:179). (They are more astray than cattle because they have the capacity to reason and do not utilize it).

A parent having grown tired of trying to reform a wayward child leaves the child to wander in his own way. The child has sealed his ears to his parent's words. He has set up a barrier between himself and parent. The cause of the sinner's faculties being sealed is due to their continued rejection of the Prophet. The more they are called to Allah, the more obstinate they become. The more Islam triumphs the greater their hatred becomes. They have sealed themselves out from Divine light.

Why do we need the Qur'an?: Allah God gave instructions to all nations, to suit their needs at the time, much like parents instructing growing children until that child reaches maturity. It is not uncommon for the Qur'an and the Bible, as well as other Divine revelations, to have similar teachings, since they are from the same one God. But as noted, revelations previous to the Qur'an, suffers from want of “pristine purity.” The Qur'an, through which God's guidance to man is completed, much like that child reaching maturity, highlights the false doctrines –such as polytheism, independent existence of the soul and matter, karma and reincarnation, divinity of humans, inherited sin, vicarious atonement– and gives guidance to all mankind until the Day of Judgment, in matters of moral, social, intellectual, and spiritual development. (Creation of the soul is dealt with later).

1. “In the name of God, the Compassionate, the Merciful.” This is the formula at the beginning of the chapters (except the ninth) of the Qur'an.

The Swami, after speculating as to the true meaning of this verse, states: “If (the Mohammedan) God be merciful, why has He sanctioned that men should inflict great suffering on other creatures by killing them for their food,” and “He should have also advised men to begin only good deeds in His name and not evil ones. Thus the passage (under discussion) is quite ambiguous;” “The Mohammedan God can never be called Merciful, because He shows no mercy towards those animals (whose slaughter He sanctions”).–(LOT, p. 651).

(The Veda also sanctions the killing of animals. As well as the Ramayana. Rama and Laksmana are said to have killed many animals. Goats are sacrificed on a daily basis to the goddess, Kali. Are/were these animals not inflicted with great suffering? Or is killing of animals allowed only in Hinduism?)

As noted above, Swami Dayananda notes from the teaching of Hinduism that a wife who “out of her family pride desert her husband and misconduct herself, let the king condemn her to be devoured by dogs before all men and women.”(LOT, p.199).

So it is not allowed to kill cows for food but it is allowed to feed women to “dogs.”

When Muslims slaughter we offer the prayer “In the name of Allah! Allah is great!” – we do not pray “In the name of Allah, the Beneficent, the Merciful” at the time of slaughtering. Mus-lims who offer such a prayer at the time of slaughter is in error.

Allāh, God, tells us that we Muslims “are best nation raised up for men: you enjoin good and forbid evil and you believe in Allah”–(Qur'an 3:109). In order to retain this lofty status we must practice what we preach. We are to do good so as to enjoin good,

and are to avoid evil so as to forbid evil. Allāh also tells us that all things from Him are good.

In the prayer, “In the name of Allah the Beneficent, the Merciful” Muslims are reminding ourselves that Allah is our Benefactor and that He is always open to mercy. And since Allah is good and all things from Him are good, and He has instructed us to do good and to avoid evil, the Muslim who utters this prayer with such consciousness would not commit an evil act. He is instantly reminded that He is committing an act in the name of Allāh, God. This act must not be an evil one. In effect this prayer: “In the name of Allah the Beneficent, the Merciful” assists us to do good and avoid evil.

Contrary to what is being propagated there is no vegetarianism in Hinduism; Hinduism sanctions the killing and eating of animals. Sheldon I. Pollock in *The Ramayana of Valmiki, Vol. II*, notes that Rama and his brother, Laksmana

“killed four large animals—a boar, an antelope, a gazelle, and a great black buck. They were famished and took meat hurriedly.” “Proceeding two miles further, the brothers Rama and Laksmana killed many animals such as are pure to consume and ate them in a grove by the Yamuna.”(pp. 183, 190).

About Rama eating meat, C. Rajagopalachari wrote in his *Ramayana*: “Some good men are troubled by this. But meat was not prohibited for Kshatriyas. Indeed, *it has always been the rule in India* to permit any food legitimately obtained and consecrated as a sacrifice. Raama was a Kshatriya and he lived in the forest in the Kshatriya way, though abstemiously.” (p. 90. *Italics added*).

(Rama may not have killed and eaten animals, seeing that the *Ramayana* is “mythology,” as Rajagopalachari says. It does, however, establish that killing and eating of animals is permissible in Hinduism; if it was not, the sage(s) who wrote the *Ramayana* would not have attributed such acts to Rama).

Jawaharlal Nehru wrote, “The eating of beef, previously countenanced, is later absolutely prohibited. In the Mahabharata there are references to beef or veal being offered to honoured guests.” (*The Discovery of India*, p.108). (This prohibition may have been instituted by Buddha).

The *Gita* (3:14): “Rains are produced by performance of yajna [sacrifice]...”

“Lord Buddha is the incarnation of Krsna...Although there are certain restrictive rules and regulations regarding animal sacrifice for particular purposes in the *Vedas*, people of demonic tendency still took to animal sacrifice without reference to the Vedic principles. Lord Buddha appeared to stop this nonsense and to establish the Vedic principles of nonviolence.”—(Swami Prabhupada, *Bhaga-vad-Gita As It Is* (4:7). (Seems that Buddha only put an end to sacrifices that were “without reference to the Vedic principles.” It is unlikely that Buddha would criticize or prohibit any ordinance of God.)

Swami Prabhupada, commenting on the *Bhagavad Gita As It Is* 18:3, states:

"Although animal killing in a sacrifice is recommended in the Vedic literature, the animal is not considered to be killed. The sacrifice is to give a new life to the animal. Sometimes the animal is given a new animal life after being killed in the sacrifice, and sometimes the animal is promoted immediately to the human form of life." (In which event the Muslims annual sacrifice of Eid-ul-Adha might be doing a tremendous good to millions of souls trapped in animal forms by freeing them "immediately to the human form of life."

In some parts of India "The *gramadevatas* (village deities) continue to be propitiated with animal sacrifices as a way of warding off and removing epidemics, crop failures, and other natural disasters."—(*Ency. Brit.* 15th edn; art. *gramadevata*, Vol. IV, p. 667).

And goats are "sacrificed" to the goddess Kali "daily." And "to avert cattle epidemics a bull is sacrificed to Rudra" (who is Shiva in another form) (Hamlyn, *Man and his Gods*, p. 180).

And whereas Swami Dayananda states, "Horse-sacrifice and cow-sacrifice not being enjoined by the *Vedas*...."—(LOT. p. 141), the Rig Veda mentions *horse sacrifice*—*Ashwamedh yajna*:

"We will, with Indra and all Gods to aid us,
bring these existing worlds into subjection.
Our sacrifice, our bodies, and our offspring,
 let Indra form together with Adityas.
With the Adityas, with the band of Maruts,
 may Indra be Protector of our bodies."

(X. CLVII. 1-3. Vol. 2, p. 645)

According to the note, the above three verses "were recited at the Asvamedha or Horse Sacrifice."

The Rig Veda, I. CLXII. 1-22. Vol. 1, pp. 227-230 speaks of Horse Sacrifice. (Notes in brackets under applicable verses are the comments of Griffith):

2. "What time they bear before the Courser, covered

with trappings and with wealth, the grasped oblation,
 The dappled goat goeth straightforward, bleating,
 to the place dear to Indra and to Pusan.

(*Grasped oblation*: the offering that is to be made for the horse, and which had been taken from the remains of the burnt-offering made the night before.

The dappled goat: this goat is to be tied to the horse at the sacrificial post. *Pusan* here is said by Sayana to stand for Agni).

3. Dear to all Gods, this goat, the share of Pusan, is first
 led forward with the vigorous Courser,
While Tvastar sends him forward with the Charger,
 acceptable for sacrifice, to glory.

4. When thrice the men lead round the Steed, in order,
 who goeth to the Gods as meet oblation,
The goat precedeth him, the share of Pusan, and to the
 Gods the sacrifice announceth.

(*Who goeth to the Gods*: the object of the sacrifice is to send the horse to the Gods that he may obtain wealth and other blessings for his sacrificers).

9. What part of the Steed's flesh the fly hath eaten, or is
left sticking to the post or hatchet,
Or to the slayer's hands and nails adhereth,—among the
Gods, too, may all this be with thee.

10. Food undigested steaming from his belly, and any
odour of raw flesh remaining,
This let the immolators set in order and dress the
sacrifice with perfect cooking.

12. They who observing that the Horse is ready call out
and say, the smell is good; remove it;
And, craving meat, await the distribution,—may their
approving help promote our labour.

13. The trial-fork of the flesh-cooking cauldron, the
vessels out of which the broth is sprinkled,
The warming pots, the covers of the dishes, hooks,
carving-boards,—all these attend the Charger.

18. The four-and-thirty ribs of the swift Charger, kin to
the Gods, the slayer's hatchet pierces.
Cut ye with skill, so that the parts be flawless, and
piece by piece declaring them dissect them.

19. Of Tvastar's Charger there is one dissector,—this is
the custom—two there are who guide him.
Such of his limbs as I divide in order, all these, amid
the balls, in fire I offer.

20. Let not thy dear soul burn thee as thou comest, let
not the hatchet linger in thy body.
Let not a greedy clumsy immolator, missing the
joints, mangle thy limbs unduly.

21. No, here thou diest not, thou art not injured:
by easy paths unto the Gods thou goest.
Both bays, both spotted mares are now thy
fellows, and to the ass's pole is yoked the Charger.

(*Both Bays*: thou art now associated in heaven with the two bay horses of Indra, the two spotted mares of the Maruts, and the ass that draws the chariot of the Asvins).

22. May this Steed bring us all-sustaining riches, wealth
in good kine, good horses, manly offspring.

Freedom from sin may Aditi vouchsafe us: the Steed
with our oblations gain us lordship!” ~~~

(Notably, verse 21 above says that in this sacrifice, the horse is “not injured.” And as recalled, the Swami says: “If (the Mohammedan) God be merciful, why has He sanctioned that men should inflict great suffering on other creatures by killing them for food,” and “The Mohammedan God can never be called Merciful, because He shows no mercy towards those animals (whose slaughter He sanctions”). So when Hindus kill animals they are “not injured,” but when Muslims kill animals they are?

If the Muslim God “can never be called Merciful” because He allows the killing of animals for food, what is the Hindu God to be called for allowing the killing of animals (horses) so Hindus can receive “all-sustaining riches, wealth in good kine, good horses, manly off-spring;” and even “Freedom from sin” and the gaining of “lordship”?)

Regarding this horse sacrifice. The *Ramayana* by C. Rajagopalachari, records Rama as saying to Guha: “I must not touch dishes daintily cooked and served. We have to live only on fruits, roots and permissible kinds of meat such as we offer in the sacrificial fire.”—(p. 88).

What is this “permissible kinds of meat” that Rama spoke of that is offered in the “sacrificial fire”? Is it the meat of the sacrificial horse?

Regarding cow-sacrifice, the Rig Veda—(X. LXXVI. 13-14. Vol. 2, p. 548) says:

“Wealthy Vrsakapayi....
Indra will eat thy bulls, thy
dear oblation that effecteth much.
Supreme is Indra over all.
Fifteen in number, then, for
me a score of bullocks they prepare,
and I devour the fat thereof:
they fill my belly full with food. ...”

(The note to verse 14 says: “Indra speaks. *Fifteen*: sacrificers; probably Vrsakapi and his wife, and their sons and daughters-in-law. Sayana explains differently: – ‘The worshippers dress for me fifteen (and) twenty bulls.’—Wilson.”). **One explanation of the verse could not be—‘The worshippers dress for me fifteen (and) twenty bulls’ if there were no bull/cow sacrifice in Hinduism/Vedism.**

Again, the Rig Veda—(X. CLV. 5. Vol. 2, p. 644) says:

“These men have led about the cow,
have duly carried Agni round,
And raised their glory to the Gods.
Who will attack them
with success?”

And the note says about *These men* mentioned in the verse: “According to Sayana, the Visvedevas are meant, who have brought back the stolen cattle. But the reference is probably to the sacrifice which the priests are performing.”

Whichever view is correct, it is obvious that cow-sacrifice is/was a practice of Hinduism. If it was not it could not have been opined, in this verse where cows are mentioned, that sacrifice of the priests may be meant.

As already noted, Jawaharlal Nehru states: “The eating of beef, previously countenanced, is later absolutely prohibited. In the Mahabharata there are references to beef or veal being offered to honoured guests.”

Further. The Rig Veda says about the Maruts, (who Mr. Griffith notes that according to Wilson), are “deified mortals” (Vol. 1. p. 104 note # 3). And the Rig Veda says of these Maruts:

“Held in your manly arms.....
Deer-skins are on their shoulders....”
(I. CLXVI. 10. Vol. 1, p. 245)

It is strange that these “deified mortals” of Hinduism/Vedism would be adorned with deer-skins if the killing of animals were forbidden by God.

Again:

“Her tooth a deer, dressed
in an eagle’s feather,
bound with cow-hide, launched forth,
She flieth onward,”
(VI. LXXV. 11. Vol. 1, p. 693).

(This verse is describing an arrow, the point being “made of a piece of a deer’s horn attached to the shaft with leather strings.” –Griffith).

Unless this deer was killed, it would be cruel to cut off its horn. How did they acquire this “cow-hide” to strap the “deer’s horn” onto the arrow, if the cow was not killed? Surely, it would be an abomination to skin the cow alive. If it is illegal to kill cows, it must be, through a point of reason, also illegal to make use of its dead parts. To use its dead parts would be condoning others killing it.

(Swami Dayananda wrote: “It is true that in eating and drinking out of the hands of flesh-eaters and wine-drinkers, such as the Mahomedans and the Christians, there is some danger of even the *Aryas*—followers of the *Veda*—contracting these evil habits, e.g., eating flesh and drinking intoxicants.”(LOT, p. 320).

There may be few, if any, vegetarian products produced by Muslims on the International market. But since Christians are both “flesh-eaters and wine-drinkers,” perhaps a survey can be conducted to determine how many vegetarians/Hindus began “eating flesh and drinking intoxicants” after eating and drinking the milk and pop and juices, yogurt, cheese, peanut butter, butter, various crackers and bread, and other products produced by Christians). (See [VEGETARIANISM](#)).

2. “Praise be to God, the Lord of all creatures, the Compassion-ate, the Merciful” (Qur'an 1:1-2.) (LOT, p. 652).

The verse that says to “Put Infidels to swords,” is used here out of context. (This subject has been dealt with elsewhere).

That the Qur'an says to kill the Unbelievers, is a statement applicable only during the time of battle. Even then Muslims are urged to take prisoners and to set them free—(Qur'an 47:4); and more importantly, to make peace with the enemies when they desire peace: "And if they incline to peace, incline thou also to it"—(Qur'an 8:61).

Allāh, God, commands also that fighting is allowed against those who fight against you and on behalf of the weak —(Qur'an 2:190; 4:75; 22:39); until there is no persecution, and religion is only for Allah —(Qur'an 2:193; 8:39); to free the captives —(Qur'an 47:4); to teach and protect the idolaters —(Qur'an 9:6); that there is no compulsion in religion —(Qur'an 2:256; 109:1-6); and that "The truth is from your Lord, so let him who please believe, and let him who please disbelieve" —(Qur'an 18:29); as this verse shows, disbelievers cannot be killed when they are free to "disbelieve."

That Muslims are to "slay the unbelievers wheresoever ye find them"—this refers only to those who fight against the Muslims—(Qur'an 2:191).

Allāh is Just and Merciful. Surely, the Swami must know that punishment is a benefit to people. As he himself declared: "*The infliction of a heavy punishment on one man prevents others from committing similar crimes, and tends to keep them steadfast in righteousness.*" —(LOT, p. 200). And that "*Justice and mercy* differ only in name. The object served by justice is the same as accomplished by *mercy*. Now the object of inflicting punishment through *justice* is to prevent people from committing crimes and thereby enable them to be freed from pain and misery. What is the object of *mercy* but to rid people of misery?" (LOT, p. 207).

There is none who had more right than Mohammad to inflict this "heavy punishment" onto the idolaters for their persecuting, attempted assassination, exiling, and fighting him to prevent the Message of Allāh God, from being heard.

Bear in mind, Mohammad did not force the Message, only preach it. Whether one accepts it or rejects it, it is not Mohammad's concern.

Allāh, God, does show mercy to sinners. He implores us in loving, compassionate terms, as He revealed to the Prophet Mo-hammad: Say: O My servants who have sinned against their souls, despair not of the mercy of Allah, surely Allah forgives all sins. Verily, He is Most Forgiving, Ever Merciful"—(Qur'an 39: 53. Also 12:87; 15:56).

It is the nature of Allah to be merciful—(Qur'an 6:12, 54). His mercy encompasses all things—(Qur'an 7:56; 40:7). Allah is so Just and Merciful that He enjoins on us in Qur'an 16:126-128:

"And if you take your turn,
then punish with the like
of that with which you were afflicted.

But if you show patience,
it is certainly best for the patient."

"And be patient and thy patience is not
but by (the help of) Allah, and grieve not
for them, nor be in distress for what they plan."
"Surely Allah is with those who keep their duty
and those who do good (to others)"

Hinduism also teaches the eradication of enemies. The Swami quotes the Yajur Veda as saying: “O ye learned men!and rid the world of its enemies”–(Yajur Veda, IX, 40.)(LOT, p. 163).

And the Rig Veda says: “O Agni...Destroy the cursing Raksasas...”–(IV. IV. 15. Vol. 1, p. 426).

Interestingly, the Swami quotes Qur'an 2:58 (out of context), where Allāh says: “And say forgiveness; and we will pardon you your sins, give an increase to the doers of good.” And he (the Swami) states “Why should one fear sin when he is given the promise of redemption?....God can never do injustice, but if He pardons the sinners, He renders Himself unjust” (LOT, p. 661).

Yet –regarding “The Aryas are still treading “the wicked path of the despicable low *Duryodhana*, the destroyer of his race and the enemy of his country– the Swami himself prays: “May God through His mercy rid us, *Aryas*, of this dreadful disease.” (LOT, p. 321).

And the Rig Veda says: “What sin we have at any time committed against the Gods, our friend, our house’s chieftain, Thereof may this our hymn be expiation.” (I. CLXXXV. 8. Vol. 1, p. 264)

Not only does the Hindu God(s) also forgive sins, but Hindus also, just as Muslims, can make offerings for the “expiation” of sins.

But how can the Hindu God(s) have mercy/grant forgiveness when Hindus are subjected to the dictates of karma, which cannot be changed –awarding us exactly what we deserve?

Regarding this forgiveness of sins. After the Grand Dissolution of the universe, do the souls that were reincarnated as sub-humans return as humans in the new Creation, or do they return as what they were before the Grand Dissolution, so as to complete their term as sub-humans?

If they return as humans, their sins would have been forgiven, which would make God “unjust,” according to the Swami. If they are returned as sub-humans to complete their term, they would have to “remain in custody” for billions of years (the period of Emancipation) to pass without getting to serve their time and be free sooner, which would make God to have done a “wrong,” according to the Swami.

3. “The King of the day of judgment. Thee only do we worship and of Thee do we beg assistance. Direct thou us on the right path”–(Qur'an 1:3, 4-5).

The Swami comments: “Does not God always administer justice If He administers justice only on one particular day, He does wrong....Is the right path that of the Mohammedans alone and not of others?....If good is the same in all religions, the Mohammedan religion can have no superiority over others. If the Mohammedans do not believe that other religions are just as good as their own, they are prejudiced.” (LOT, p. 652).

As the Swami and his followers believe that Hinduism/Vedism is better than other religion(s), by the Swami’s own reasoning he and his followers “are prejudiced” against other religions. If “good is the same in all religions,” Hinduism/Vedism “can have no superiority over others.”

That Islam is superior to all other religions has already been proven—there are no Divinely revealed doctrines as karma, reincarnation, Trinity, Divine sonship, God Incarnate, chosen people to the exclusion of others, inherited sin, and vicarious atonement; these doctrines are assumed and propagated as Divine truth. Even the Hindu Holy Books are not of pristine purity:

“the Vedas grew from one into four, and then from four to as many as 1131, there is a verse in Maha Bhashya which explains that there are one hundred and one shoots of Yajurveda, one thousand of Samaveda, twenty-one kinds of Rigveda and nine of Atharvaveda”. (A.H. Vidyarthi, *Muhammad in World Scriptures*, Vol. 1, p. 315). (See [ISLAM. QUR’AN. HINDUISM. CHRISTIANITY. JUDAISM](#)).

This, however, does not mean that Islam/Muslims “are prejudiced.” As Allāh, God, gave guidance to all people, and as all religions are for Him, Islam/Muslims cannot be “prejudiced” against anyone, Hindu or other. The followers of other prophets of God were also on the “right path.”

Allāh is not “King” of the Day of the Judgment. He is “Master” of the Day of Judgment; as Muhammad Ali has explained, “a master is more than a king,” “which shows that Allah is not guilty of injustice if He forgives His servants, because He is not a mere king or a mere judge, but more properly a Master.” The adoption of “King as the translation of the word *Malik*” is “not correct.”

Considering that every second of every day people are dying world-wide, it makes sense for Allāh, God, to have one day on which to give Judgment.

Allāh has given man respite till an appointed term, when he will be called to account for his actions. That some people, such as the opponents of the Prophet and criminals, are punished through defeat and magistracy does not mean that they should not be subjected to eventual judgment and punishment. This earthly punishment is only to put an end to their aggression. The second punishment is for violating the law of Allāh, God. This latter punishment would be in proportion to their violation of this law of God.

One does not have to believe in Allāh to know that causing harm to others is wrong. All sins are committed against God, whether one believes in Him or not—by transgressing His commands, such as evil plots though the victim may have escaped the plot, hypocrisy, and illicit relations even though of mutual consent—and committed against another—such as murder, theft, bodily injury, aggression. So if a person is punished in this life for the latter sin, he still has to account for the former, i.e. violating the commands of Allāh, God. If he is not punished in this life for sin(s) against another, he has to account for both on the Day of Judgment.

If God reincarnates the soul immediately upon the death of one creature, with all the people and other creatures dying every minute world-wide God must be busy portioning off and directing souls into the wombs of fowls and ducks and geese and other birds, into sheep and goats and pigs and dogs and cats and cows and other animals, into the eggs of fish and turtles and insects and flies etc; and into humans, and into trees. **Such a belief cannot be the religion of “enlightened” mankind.**

(*A Brahmachari is a person who is under the vow of celibacy, which may be for a period of 24, 44, or 48 years, as the Swami explains*). The Swami opines that “it is a *Brahmachari* alone, who attains to success in worldly affairs, enjoys perfect sensuous pleasures and spiritual happiness.”—(LOT, p. 42)

Muslims are not only allowed multiple wives but are avid meat-eaters who were ruling the world a mere hundred years after the revelation of the Qur'an. Likewise there are/were many Christians and other non-Hindus, who are not *Brahmacharis*, who “attains to success in worldly affairs, enjoys perfect sensuous pleasures and spiritual happiness.” Perhaps, there are/were many Hindus also who were not *Brahmacharis* that have attained “success in worldly affairs, enjoys perfect sensuous pleasures and spiritual happiness.”

“He that remains a *Brahmachari*, till he is 48 years of age...by virtue of this highest kind of *Brahmacharya* acquires perfect knowledge, perfect physical strength” (etc); and “enjoys the full span of life which is 400 years,” writes the Swami.—(LOT, p. 42).

Now, since the revelation of the Vedas nearly two billion years ago how many *Brahmacharis* have lived to be 400 years?

Wouldn't one say that Einstein, who was Jewish, had “perfect knowledge, perfect physical strength”? (Apologies if Einstein was a “*Brahmachari*”).

4. “The path of those to whom Thou hast been gracious, not of those against whom Thou art incensed, nor of those who go astray.” (Qur'an 1: 6-7). (LOT, pp. 652-653).

(One does not have to have sins in a previous life to seek forgiveness. We have sins in our present life for which to seek forgiveness).

Those “against whom Thou art incensed” are the Jews who had incurred the wrath of Allah, by breaking their covenant, disbelieving in His messages and killing prophets; and the Christians are the ones who have gone astray by imputing divinity to Jesus; and that Muslims are praying to be kept free from these infractions. As Muhammad Ali has noted that the Prophet Mohammad is reported as saying: “Those upon whom wrath is brought down are the Jews and those who went astray are the Christians”—(Tirmidhi 44:2).

Incidentally, Hindus, as the Rig Veda teaches, are to pray:

“O Gods, who fain would lend your aid,
destroy us not as ye destroy
Your enemies who go astray.”

And thee too, O great Aditi, thee also,
Goddess, I address,
Thee very gracious to assist.

Save us in depth and shallow from the foe,
thou Mother of Strong Sons:

Let no one of our seed be harmed.”

(VIII. LVI. 9-11. Vol. 2, p. 225
Italics/emphasis added).

So how is it that Hindus are allowed to pray for the grace of God and Muslims are not allowed to pray for His grace? Isn't the Hindu God “open to the charge of being partial by showing favour to some and disfavour to others inasmuch as it is quite unjust to

bestow happiness on men or subject them to pain and suffering without paying any regard to their merits and demerits.”

6. “There is an infirmity in their hearts and God hath increased that infirmity.”—(Qur'an 2:9). The Swami questions: “Well! did God increase their infirmity, while they were innocent? (LOT, p. 654)

When read in its context, this verse shows that the disbelievers believed they were deceiving Allah and Muslims by feigning belief in Allah. Allah is saying that they only deceive them-selves. The more Islam became successful the greater their effort against Truth became. Thus, by their own action this “disease” to deceive was increased by themselves, (much as the example of the increasing of the enviousness of the covetous person given above.)

As noted above every person is born sinless and with a choice to act justly or corruptly. Allāh, God, is good, gives guidance, and is Ever-Forgiving!

7. “Who hath spread the earth as a bed for you and the heaven as a covering”—(Qur'an 2:22). “Well!” says the Swami, “Can the heaven be a covering for anything? Now does it not show ignorance (of the author of the Quran)? It is absurd to believe in the sky being a covering. If the Mohammedans believe some kind of planet to be the heaven, it can only be the work of their own imagination.”—(LOT, pp. 654-655).

But as Muhammad Ali explains: “The heaven is here called a *structure* in reference to the order which prevails in heavenly bodies. But *bina* is also used to signify *the roof* or the *ceiling of a house*, and as such is used figuratively to indicate the vast blue overhead. Attention is thus drawn to the oneness of humanity, as if it were a single family living in one resting-place under one roof.”

Malik Ghulam Farid notes “that just as a building or a roof is a means of protection for those living in or under it, similarly the remoter parts of the universe serve as a protection for our planet (earth); and those who have studied the science of the stars, the clouds and other atmospheric phenomena, know how the other heavenly bodies, running their courses through the boundless expanse rising high above the earth on all sides, make for its safety and stability. It is also hinted here that the perfection of the material world depends upon the coordination between earthly and heavenly forces.”

8. In Qur'an 2:21-22, Allāh has challenged the doubters to produce a chapter like that of the Qur'an. And that the fuel of the fire of Hell would be men and stones. To which the Swami asserts: “Well! Is it impossible to produce a chapter like unto it? Did not Maulvi Faizi in the time of king Akbar compile a Quran without making use of any dotted letters in it?” (LOT, p. 655)

If compiling a Qur'an “without making use of any dotted letters in it” was the same as producing a chapter like that of the Qur'an, there are probably thousands, if not millions, of Christians of both Arab and non-Arab descent who are eager to belie the Qur'an as the Word of Allāh, God, and would already have produced the Qur'an. And long before Maulvi Faizi.

Regarding men and stones being the fuel of the fire of Hell. Stones here may signify the leaders, who are generally the more hardened against a cause and *men* would be the followers of these leaders.

As mentioned already, Islam teaches that there are righteous people of all religions. Those who disbelieved their prophets –be it Moses, Jesus, Mohammad, or any of the other prophets that Allah God raised up for man—are the ones who will be sent to Hell. The difference between earthly fire and the Hell-fire is that in the Hell-fire the body is not consumed, it is not reduced to ashes. (Hell has various shades of meaning, see HELL).

9. “But bear good tidings unto those who believe and do good works that they shall have gardens watered by rivers; so oft as they eat of the fruit thereof for sustenance, they shall say, this is what we have formerly eaten of; and they shall be supplied with several *sorts of fruit* having a mutual resemblance to one another. There shall they enjoy wives subject to no impurity, and there shall they continue for ever”–(Qur'an 2:24).

The Swami comments: “The Paradise described in the Quran is in no respect better than this world, because the same sort of things that are obtainable here are to be had there....We would like to know how these poor women pass their days till the day of judgment?Similarly in the temple of God (paradise) women are valued and loved more than men by God. They live forever in heaven but not men. How can this arrangement last unless God desires it? The Mohammedan God is surely in danger of falling in love with these women!!!” (LOT, pp. 655-656).

(How do yogis pass their time in the forest? What makes the Swami, and his followers, believe that these women are there in Paradise before the day of Judgment? Allāh can create what He wills, when He wills, and how He wills)

Surely, an Indian living in another country would recognize his favorite national food when given it, and would remind him of his life in India. So where is the problem if the inhabitants of Paradise are given fruits that delight them in this life? What is the problem if they are given “wives” of purity? In fact these “fruits” and “wives” may very well be of the allegorical state-ments of the Qur'an. For as already noted *no eye has seen and no ear has heard, nor can the heart of man conceive* what Allah God has prepared for His righteous servants.

We are not the only beings in existence. Allāh, God reveals: “And of His signs is the creation of the heavens and the earth and what He has spread forth in **both** of them of living beings. And He is All-powerful to gather them together, when He will”–(Qur'an 42:29).

If the horses that are sacrificed in the Hindu fire can go to heaven and be “associated” forever with the two horses of Indra, women can surely live forever in paradise. If Hindu mortals can be “deified,” Muslims can be made to live forever in paradise.

Whereas time spent in Hell by a sinner will be proportional to his sin–(Qur'an 78:21-26); the rewards of heaven is a gift from Allāh never to end–(Qur'an 11:108; 15:45, 48). And whereas punishment is equal to the crime, the reward for doing good is manifold–(Qur'an 6:161. Bokhari, Vol. 1, # 40).

10. “And he (Allah God) taught Adam the names of all things, and then proposed them to the angels, and said, “Declare unto me the names of these things if ye say truth.” God said, ‘O Adam, tell them their names” and when he had told them their names, God said, “Did I not tell you that I know the secrets of heaven and earth and know that which ye discover, and that which ye conceal.” (Qur'an 2:31, 33). And the Swami questions:

“Could God ever deceive His angels in this way in order to impress them with His Greatness?” “It was an act of sheer imposture on His part. No enlightened man could ever believe such a thing of God, nor would he display such hauteur. Was it by these means that God wanted to display His supernatural powers? Such quackery can only flourish among the savages but not among the civilized.” (LOT, p. 656).

But reading from verse 30 (*which the Swami did not quote*) would show that when Allāh told the angels that He was going to put a ruler on earth, the angels said “Wilt Thou place in it such as make mischief in it and shed blood?” To which Allah God replied, “Surely, I know what you know not.”

God teaching Adam the names of “all things” “does not imply absolute totality. It simply means *all that was necessary*. The Qur'an uses this word in this sense elsewhere also (6:45; 27:17, 24; 28:58)” explains Malik Ghulam Farid.

Muhammad Ali quotes Razi as explaining the word *asmaa*, of the Qur'anic text, in which God taught Adam these names, that: “He taught him the attributes of things and their descriptions and their characteristics, for the attributes of a thing are indicative of its nature.”

God taught Adam the nature of these things and asked him to give them names.

The fact that the Qur'an did not say angels were taught the nature of these things does not necessarily mean that angels did not know of them. Evidence of this can be inferred in that God did not actually instruct Iblis to bow down along with angels to Adam. The fact that Iblis was in the presence of the angels made him subjected to this command. Likewise the angels must have been in the presence when Adam was taught the names of these things.

The angels having preceded Adam in being created must have been aware of the nature of these things.

Muhammad Ali points out, “Man is the greatest killer on this earth but he also turns the gifts of God to the best use. The angels speak of the darker side of the picture of humanity (*that man would shed blood*), but to God was known the brighter side as well as the darker side of this picture. Hence the words *I know what you know not* (verse 30)”, explains Muhammad Ali.

God calling Adam to, and Adam being able to, name these creatures were proof to the angels of the wisdom of man. It “signifies the vast capability of man and the superiority of his knowledge to that of the angels,” says Muhammad Ali.

The Swami wrote: “This indicates that the Mohammedan God was not Omniscient i.e., He was not cognizant of the three periods of time—the past, the present, and the future. Had He been Omniscient, He would not have created Satan. Nor was God All-powerful, since when Satan deliberately refused to obey Him he could do nothing against him.”—(LOT, p. 656).

In the nearly two billion years since God revealed the Veda(s) to teach mankind, and with about 75 percent of the world not being of the Vedic religion, from the Swami's own pronouncements it seems that the Hindu God was not Omniscient. He did not know the past, the present, and the future—having failed in his object to have all mankind know the Vedas. Neither does all Hindu adhere to the Vedas, which means, according to the Swami's view, the Vedic God is not All-powerful to have them accept the Veda(s).

Whereas Mohammad, who it is said wrote the Qur'an for his own "selfish ends", would seem, according to the Swami's reasoning, to be more Omniscient than the God of the Vedas. For in a period less than two thousand years after his mission Mohammad's followers outnumber those of the Vedic religion.

(Iblis being commanded to bow down to Adam has already been dealt with elsewhere).

And the Rig Veda (I. XXV. 13. Vol. 1, p. 35) tells us that Varuna has spies: "Varuna....His spies are seated round about."

Since the Hindu God need "spies" He, according to the Swami, is not Omniscient.

These angels/spies are not to be compared with the angels of the Qur'an, who act only according to Allāh's, God's, command. Nor are these angels/spies of the Veda to be compared with the recorders of our deeds, as Islam teaches. These recorders record both good and bad actions, whereas spies report only those actions that are against the State.

12. Regarding the Qur'an-(2:35-37) allegorical story of Adam and Eve being instructed not to eat of the "tree," the Swami questions, "how did Adam come down to earth?" "Did Adam fly down like a bird or fall down like a stone?" (LOT, p. 657).

In the same vein one may ask the Swami, and his followers (and Hindus in general), considering that the soul has no eyes and limbs, how is the soul "Guided by God" into the womb of the chicken to establish itself "in the womb"? Does God clear away the feathers from the chicken and place the soul at that part for it to enter?

(Whereas the story of Adam is allegorical this journey of the soul, according to the Swami, is literal. Please consult Muhammad Ali's translation of the Qur'an for an explanation of the story of Adam. His translation of the Qur'an can be viewed online: www.muslim.org).

Adam and Eve being instructed not to eat of the tree, as explained by Muhammad Ali, is one of the allegorical statements of the Qur'an.

Whereas man is made of earth, the class of *jinns*, to which Iblis belong, are made of fire-(Qur'an 15:27); and angels, are said to be made of light-(Muslim 53:10. M. Ali, *The Religion of Islam*, p. 167).

In the Hereafter man will be given new forms-(Qur'an 56:61).

13. "Dread the day *wherein one* soul shall not make satisfaction for *another* soul, neither shall any intercession be accepted from them, nor shall any compensation be received, neither shall they be helped." (Qur'an 2:48). (LOT, pp. 657-658).

People in paradise do not need help. Allah does help those in Hell—eventually, as noted elsewhere; all the inmates will be removed. Hell is not forever.

It is obvious the wicked does not "dread the present." There are many that die without being punished for their crimes. There are perhaps many that do not care about punishment, so long as they receive pleasure from their crimes. And in the present the wealthy and the powerful can escape judgment. But in the Hereafter, in the Court of Allāh, God, there is no diplomatic immunity, no legal technicality, no hung-jury/no mistrial; no bribery; no one to "pressure" or bring "coercion and duress" on; and no godfather to shield behind his coat —in fact, the godfather would be hustling for a skirt

for himself to hide behind— you did the crime, or was involved in it, you toast the time. And considering that one Divine day is equal to a thousand human years, even if the maximum time spent in Hell is twelve months, in Divine terms that would be 365,000 human years. You're well crisped!

As to the intercession by the Prophet Mohammad. Those who reject faith will have no avenue to make up for their rejection. Intercession is only for those who endeavor to Godliness but faltered along the way.

14. “We gave Moses the book and the miracles. We said unto them, be ye changed into scouted apes. And we made them an example unto those who were contemporary with them and unto those who came after them, and a warning to the pious.” (Qur'an 2:65).

The Swami comments: “Both Quran and the Bible assert that Moses was endowed with miraculous powers, but it is absolutely incredible, inasmuch as no man can work miracles now-a-days, and what cannot be done in our day, could never have been done in the past.

....Now why does not God endow anyone with miraculous powers when both He and His devotees exist in our day.*

Now either what God said regarding their (transgressors') being changed into scouted apes in order to make an example for others never came to pass or He must have resorted to trickery.” –(LOT, p. 658).

*(According to Hindus, God does show miracles now-a-days: the idols of two of their Gods, Shiva and Ganesh, were said to have drunk milk. –*Toronto Star*, Friday, September 22, 1995, p. A2).

Since God can create the Universe, and raise creatures from the dirt and have them reproduce themselves from within their own bodies, and produce various fruits and varieties, and flowers of different hues and instill in them fragrances, He can certainly part the Red Sea, and send hail and locusts to plague Pharaoh. Which is more difficult, to part the Red Sea and send hail or to create the Universe?

The reason why God no longer performs miracles (as we expect miracles to be) is simple: God performs miracles through His prophets. There are no prophets now, and no need for miracles, as His favor to mankind was completed 1400 years ago and has perfected man's religion—(Qur'an 5:3).

God's last and greatest miracle was given through the Prophet Mohammad; this miracle is still living with us today, and will live with us to the Day of Judgment, for all mankind to marvel over—the Qur'an.

These Jewish violators of their Sabbath were not turned into actual apes. Only that they were made “*morally like apes*.” The Book of Ezekiel (22:8-15), as Muhammad Ali detailed, gives an account of this moral degeneration of the Jews. In Qur'an 2:61, Allāh, God, says of the Jews: “...And abasement and humiliation were stamped upon them, and they incurred Allah's wrath. That was so because they disbelieved in the messages of Allah and would kill the prophets unjustly. That was so because they disobeyed and exceeded the limits.” To which Muhammad Ali comments:

“The verse speaks of the ultimate condition to which the Israelites were reduced when they persisted in setting at naught the Divine commandments and indulged in im-moral and depraved practices. A comparison with 3:111 will show the truth

of this remark, for that verse, which is almost identical with the one under discussion, clearly refers to the later history of Israel—(3:111 states: “Abasement will be their lot wherever they are found, except under a covenant with Allah and a covenant with men, and they shall incur the wrath of Allah, and humiliation will be made to cling to them. This is because they disbelieved in the messages of Allah and killed the prophets unjustly. This is because they disobeyed and exceeded the limits”—The truth of this prophecy regarding the fate of the Jewish nation is amply borne out by Jewish history. The Jews are the wealthiest of nations but their lot is miserable in almost every country of the world, notwithstanding their great influence in politics it remains so to this day. Moses had promised the same fate for them: “The Lord shall scatter thee among all people, from one end of the earth even unto the other....And among those nations thou shalt find no ease, neither shall the sole of thy foot have rest; but the Lord shall give thee a trembling heart, and failing of eyes and sorrow of mind” (Deut. 28: 64, 65). ”

“Jesus also holds the Jews guilty for “all the righteous blood shed upon the earth, from the blood of righteous Abel unto the blood of Zacharias” (Matt. 23:25), and condemns them for their hypocritical assertion that “if we had been in the days of our fathers, we would not have been partakers with them in the blood of the prophets” (*yet they tried to kill Jesus*) (Matt. 23:30). There is an allusion here to the Jewish plans against the life of the Prophet also. The word *qatl* signifies sometimes an attempt to kill or the *doing of things which may lead to murder whether murder actually takes place or not* (RM). Whether any prophets were actually killed or not is a different question, but they undoubtedly tried to kill prophets, and made several attempts to kill the Holy Prophet Muhammad too.”—(M. Ali, Qur’anic comm. 101, 102).

15. “So God raised the dead to life, and showed you his signs, that peradventure ye may understand”—(Qur'an 2:73).

“If God raised the dead to life (in the past), why does He not do so now? Will they all remain lying in their graves till the day of judgment? Is your God on tour in these days (that He cannot find time to administer justice)? Are these (raising the dead etc.) the only proofs (of the existence) of God? Are not the earth, the sun, and the moon, etc. His signs? Is the wonderful design so manifestly seen existing in the world of no significance?”—(LOT, p. 658).

All things in creation are Signs of God—(Qur'an 10:6; 30:20-25; 41:37; 42:29). Only the moral and spiritual dead are raised: the physical dead are not returned to life—(Qur'an 23:99-100; 39:42). (*Day of Judgment is dealt with elsewhere*).

16. “They shall never continue to be the companions of paradise”—(The word “never” should be “ever”—(Qur'an 2:82). The Swami states: “As the soul is finite, its deeds—good or bad—cannot be infinite. It cannot, therefore be sent to an everlasting hell or heaven.”—(LOT, p. 659).

As already noted, Hell is not everlasting. The reward of Paradise is for long as Allah deems. Allah Who created the soul can give it life for as long as He pleases. In His infinite mercy to have us refrain from evil Allah offers a reward for goodness in excess of the good act. The wicked is not punished beyond his evil. There is no injustice in Allah

giving this excess in reward. Nor is there injustice in Allāh forgiving sinners. In the human sphere, parents also reward and forgive children, even when such children have been in violation of others. Even victims sometimes forgive their assailants, and may even take compensation in lieu of exacting punishment.

17. Qur'an 2:84-85, recounts Allah God making covenant with the Jews. To which the Swami inquires, "Is the making of covenants the work of man, possessed of finite powers, or of God? God being Omniscient cannot behave like an ordinary man." (LOT, p. 659).

Why did God reveal the Vedas? Are not His injunctions that man must worship Him only; that those who want a higher form of living must do good deeds and those who do evil would receive a lower form of life, a covenant? God making a covenant with man signifies His "giving commandments" to man.

19. "Moreover, to Moses gave we "The Book" and we, raised up apostles after him;" (Qur'an 2:87). (LOT, p. 660).

Muslims are required to believe in the Revelations given to *all* prophets. However, as has been shown in past pages, Books previous to the Qur'an are not of "pristine purity"—human hand-print has contaminated them. Allāh, God, has told us what not to believe in those books—such as Trinity, polytheism, divinity of humans, inherited sin, vicarious atonement, favored nation, karma and reincarnation. Thus, Muslims do not have to believe in all "the defects" found in these revelations.

20. "Although they had prayed for victory over those who prayed not—yet when that Quran came to them, of which they had knowledge, they did not recognise it. The curse of God is on the infidels." (Qur'an 2:89).

"You call men professing other religions infidels, while they do the same to you, and their God curses you in the same way. Now will you please tell us which of the two should be considered right and which wrong? On reflection it is clear that there are errors in all creeds," wrote the Swami. (LOT, p. 660).

(The swami has used this verse out of context and, seemingly, without knowledge as to the background against which it was revealed).

Verses 88-91 deals with the Jews believing that they had "no need of any further knowledge," as Muhammad Ali explains. That when the Qur'an came, verifying their own Book, and previously they used to pray for victory over the disbelievers, (as per the prophecy of Deut 18:15,18; 28:1-2 which speak of a prophet who would make them "victorious" over their enemies)— yet they disbelieved in the Qur'an, even though they recognized it to be fulfillment of the prophecy of Moses. And for this rejection they were cursed by God. They "could accept only a revelation granted to an Israelite," explains Muhammad Ali. Here are the verses:

"And they (Jews) say:

Our hearts are repositories.

Nay, Allah has cursed them on account
of their unbelief; so little it is that they believe.

And when there came to them a Book
from Allah verifying that which they have,
and aforetime they used to pray for

victory against those who disbelieved
 –but when there came to them that
 which they recognized, they disbelieved in it;
 so Allah's curse is on the disbelievers.
 Evil is that for which they sell their souls—that
 they should deny that which Allah has revealed,
 out of envy that Allah should send down His
 grace on whomsoever of His servants
 He pleases; so they incur wrath upon wrath.
 And there is an abasing chastisement for
 the disbelievers”
 (Qur'an 2:88-90)

If there are “errors in all creeds,” as the Swami says, the Vedas, which is the basis of Hinduism, must be in error. Clearly, a book whose teaching(s) is in “error” cannot be the religion for “enlightened” mankind. Islam, the religion chosen by Allah, God, and perfected by Him, cannot be in error.

21. “Whoso is an enemy to God or his angels or to Gabriel, or to Michael, *shall have God for his enemy*, for verily God is an enemy to infidels.”—(Qur'an 2:98). To which the Swami states: “Is he who is an enemy to others also an enemy to God? This can never be true, since God is an enemy to none.”—(LOT, p. 661)

(An Ambassador is a representative of a President/country. He who is against the Ambassador is also against the President/country).

Muhammad Ali quotes Razi that “The Jews considered Gabriel as their enemy because they thought that he was charged to convey the gift of prophecy to the Israelites, and he conveyed it to another people, i.e. Ishmaelites.” And in explaining the enmity of man to Allah God and vice versa Muhammad Ali quotes Abu Hayan that “In reality there can be no enmity between Allah and man; as to man’s enmity to Allah, it signifies opposition to His commandments, and as to Allah’s enmity to man, it signifies the recompense for his opposition.”

As the Swami says “God is an enemy to none.” Yet the Rig Veda says, (*emphasis added*):

“The Mighty One...
 devoted *Friend* of priests”
 (III. III. 8. Vol. 1, p. 340).

(The opposite of *friends* are enemies)
 “Bounteous are these, Angirases,
 Virupas: the Asura’s Heroes
 and the Sons of Heaven.”

(R.T.H.G. notes that “The Asura,’ explained by Sayana as the expeller of the *foes of the Gods* from heaven, is said to be Rudra, and his sons are the Maruts”.) (III. LIII. 7. Vol. 1, pp. 397, 399).

“O Agni....
 Destroy the cursing Rakshasas.....”
 (IV. IV. 15. Vol. 1, p. 426)
 “O Gods....destroy not us as

ye destroy Your *enemies*....”
“All Indra’s *enemies* were slain
 and passed away
 like froth and foam.”
(VIII. LVI. 9. Vol. 2, p. 225; X. CLV. 4. Vol. 2, p. 644, resp.)

The Hindu God not only has enemies, He also has spies: “Varuna, wearing golden mail.... His spies are seated round about.”—(I. XXV. 13. Vol. 1, p. 35).

22. “And say forgiveness; and we will pardon your sins, give an increase to the doers of good.”—(Qur'an 2:58). (LOT, p. 661).

If He that promises forgiveness of sins “cannot be God, nor can a book that inculcates such a doctrine be the Word of God”, then the Veda(s) is not the “Word of God” and the God that reveals it “cannot be God;” for the Veda itself teaches the forgiveness of sins. The Rig Veda says, (*Emphasis added*): (This hymn is noted to be “addressed to Vayu, Indra, Mitra, Varuna, the Visve Devas, Pusan, the Waters, Agni”)

“Whatever *sin* is found in me,
whatever evil I have wrought.
If I have lied or falsely sworn,
Waters, *remove it far from me*.”
(I. XXIII. 22. Vol. 1, p. 31).

(To “Asvins”) “Make long our days of life, and *wipe out all our sins*” (I. XXXIV. 11. Vol. 1, p. 51)

(To “Heaven and Earth”)
“What *sin* we have at any time
committed against the Gods...
Thereof *may this our hymn be expiation*.
Protect us, Heaven and Earth,
 from fearful danger”
(I. CLXXXV. 8. Vol. 1, p. 264).

(Verse 4 of the above Hymn speaks of “Parents of Gods”; the note to this verse says, “as with the Greeks, Heaven and Earth are regarded as the father and mother of the Gods.”

“Aditi, Mitra, Varuna, *forgive us however we have
erred and sinned against you*”
(II. XXVII. 14. Vol. 1, p. 311).

“Most Youthful God, *whatever sin*, through folly,
we here, as human beings, have committed,
In sight of Aditi *make thou us sinless: remit,
entirely*, Agni, our offences.”
“Even in the presence of *great sin*,
O Agni, *free us from prison of
the Gods or mortals*.”
(IV. XII. 4-5. Vol. 1, p. 435)

*“Forgive whatever sin we have committed:
may Aryaman and Aditi remove it.”
(VII. XCIII. 7. Vol. 2, p. 97).*

The above, which is among many such statements, clearly shows that the God of Hindus also teaches the forgiveness of sins. Only the God that is not merciful would not forgive His servants. Though forgiveness has its parameters.

It would be pointless for God to instruct man to pray for forgiveness if there was no forgiveness to be had.

In fact, the Swami himself quotes the Veda as teaching mercy and forgiveness: “**Mayest Thou O God.....be merciful unto us.O Lord, be merciful and...**”–(LOT, p. 1). And part of the Swami’s explanation to this verse says: “**Mayest Thou free us from all pain and grief**”–(LOT, p. 2).

How can God “free” Hindus from all “pain and grief” when they are subjected to the strictures of karma, “according to the nature of their deeds”?–(LOT, p. 660). And when “no sin can be remitted till one has suffered for it,” as the Swami states–(LOT, p. 473). If God frees or “pardons the sinners,” He would, in the words of the Swami, “renders Himself unjust”–(LOT, p. 661).

The Swami even prayed for mercy against others: “**May God through His mercy rid us, Aryas, of this dreadful disease**” (of religious “feud”)–(LOT, p. 321). It would seem to be a contradiction for the God of the Veda(s) to teach mercy and not remit any sin “till one has suffered for it.”

However, for the Hindu God to forgive sins would be a contradiction of karma, because karma **“operates impartially and unerringly, awarding us exactly what we deserve”**, as *The Higher Taste* says–(p.38).

Allah God forgives all sins, after repentance is made. Sins that are willfully repeated are not forgiven. Sins are forgiven when one repents and abstain from sins. Mercy and forgiveness are synonymous. In order to forgive one must be merciful. The result of mercy is forgiveness.

23. “And when Moses asked drink for his people, we said, “strike the rock with thy rod;” and from it their (? there) gushed twelve fountains.” (Qur'an 2:60).

“Now can anyone (except the Mohammedan God) utter such impossibilities? It is absolutely impossible to believe that twelve springs could gush forth on striking a rock with a rod, unless it had been hollowed out in the centre and filled with water and twelve holes bored therein,” wrote the Swami. (LOT, p.661).

(Krishna yet a child lifted mount Govardhana with a finger, and Mahadeo fitted an elephant’s head onto his son’s–Ganesh–body).

God raised all manner of creations from dirt, manifest water in the coconut whose volume increases with its size, have man produce seminal fluid when he matures, have the spider issue silk from its body; and He sends souls into trees, as Hindus believe, why can’t He then have rocks produce water?)

Yusuf Ali notes “The gushing of twelve springs from a rock evidently refers to a local tradition well known to Jews and Arabs in Mustafa’s time. Near Horeb close to Mount Sinai, where the Law was given to Moses, is a huge mass of red granite, twelve feet high

and about fifty feet in circumference, where European travellers (e.g. Breydenbach in the 15th Century after Christ) saw abundant springs of water twelve in number (see Sale's notes on this passage). It existed in Mustafa's time and may still exist to the present day, for anything we know to the contrary. The Jewish tradition would be based on Exod. xvii. 6: "Thou shalt smite the rock, and there shall come water out of it that the people may drink."

27. Sole Maker of the Heavens and the Earth! And when He decree a thing, He only saith to it, "Be" it is"—(Qur'an 2:117).

The Swami questions: "Now who heard God when He said "Be"?....Where from did this world come into existence when it is written in the Quran that nothing but God existed before Creation? No effect can be produced without a cause. How could He have then created this vast universe without a (material) cause."(LOT, p. 662).

It is not to be taken that Allāh, God, spoke actual words. "Be," and "it is" simply means that when Allāh decides on a matter nothing or no one can prevent its materialization. This materialization does not mean that it is instantaneous, without involving any process. Everything in creation exists on laws (of Allāh, God).

That Allāh can create from nothing. Allāh, God, has ninety-nine names plus the crowning name "Allāh" giving Him one hundred names. One of these ninety-names of Allah is *Al-Badi'* which means 'He Who creates out of nothing.'

Regarding the Creation of the heaven and the earth Allah God reveals:

"Then He (Allah) directed Himself
to the heaven And it was a vapor,
so He said to it and to the
Earth: Come both, willingly or unwillingly.
They both said: We *come willingly*"
(Qur'an 41:11)

(we '*come willingly*' or we '*submit to your command*'—Islam).

That the universe was formed from gaseous matter, as the Qur'an says, Maurice Bucaille, (already noted) wrote: "At the earliest time it can provide us with, modern science has every reason to maintain that the Universe was formed of a gaseous mass principally composed of hydrogen and a certain amount of helium that was slowly rotating."

Allāh, God, tells us that He created everything—(Qur'an 6:102). Allāh may have created the soul in similar manner as He created the heavens and the earth. Because the heavens and the earth are visible and the soul is not is no argument they could not be from the same medium. We have fragrance, an unseen, emanating from flowers, a visible object; and also invisible forces, magnet-ism and electricity, issuing from metals. Electricity is even stored (in capacitors and batteries) when the generating source is turned off. Just as much the soul could have been created and held separately from its base medium.

Allāh, God, says, "He it is Who created you from a *single soul*, and of the same did He make his mate" and "He it is Who has brought you into being from a *single soul*"—(Qur'an 7:189; 6:99). From this, it seems that Allāh created **one** soul and imparted it into the two beings, Adam and Eve, who passed it on, through procreation, to their offspring. These offspring passes it on to the next generation. Much like a fruit having

one seed which grows into a tree, producing many fruits, with each fruit carrying its own seed for reproducing. Allāh reveals:

“And certainly We create man from
an extract of clay, Then We make him a
small life-germ in a firm resting place,
Then We make the life-germ a clot,
then We make the clot a lump of flesh,
then We make (in) the lump
of flesh bones, then We clothe the bones
with flesh, then We cause it to
grow into another creation.
So blessed be Allāh, the best of creators.”
(Qur'an 23:12-14)

(As the fragrance, though a different medium, grows out of the seed, likewise the soul, though a different medium, grows out of the cell).

It is interesting to note that the Swami quotes the Bhagavad Gita 2:16 which says, “*Nothing* can ever become *something*, nor can *something* ever become *nothing*.”—(LOT, p. 261).

But in his book *The Way To True Worship*, (p. 1), Anoop Chandola says, (as already noted): “The first recorded book of the Hindus is the *Rig Veda*. In it, “being” or *sat* is said to have its beginning in non-being or *asat*. More than a thousand years later, the *Bhagavad Gita* challenged this view, holding that there is no “non-being” state of being.”

So here we have the Bhagavad Gita having “challenged this view” of creation taught by the Veda. The Swami himself says, (*in the matter of Krishna being God or not*) that the Gita being “opposed to the *Veda*, it cannot be held to be an authority.”—(LOT, p. 219). Yet here the Gita is said to be “opposed” to the Veda. So which is correct, the Gita or the Veda? In fact, the believers in the Gita may also argue that the Veda being “opposed” to the Gita, it “cannot be held to be an authority”.

Since the Gita being “opposed” to the Veda “cannot be held to be an authority,” the Vedic teaching is to be taken to be correct. This would mean that the God of the Veda could have created matter and soul out of *nothing* which is in agreement with the Qur'anic statement that Allāh, God, created everything; and that the soul and matter are not, respectively, “eternal,” “self-existing, self-creating, self-dissolving.”

(How could the Swami claim that the soul and matter are “beginningless”* when, according to the Veda God did create the soul and matter –“being...have its beginning in non-being”?)*(LOT, p. 221).

Regarding the belief that God can do whatever He likes, the Swami questions: “Can He create another God? Can He die? Can He become ill, ignorant or destitute of knowledge?”—(LOT, p. 662). “Can God kill Himself?” Or “Can He make other Gods like Himself, become ignorant, commit sins such as theft, adultery and the like? Or Can He be unhappy?” (LOT, p. 209). (If one should reply in the affirmative to the Swami, how can it be proved or disproved?)

Whereas a person can commit act(s) injurious to himself and to others, it is almost certain a wise person would not injure himself, and a just person would not harm

others, and a good person would not indulge in sins. Allāh, God, being wise, just and good, He would only exercise His power wisely and justly.

As Allah God is *Rabb—the Creator, Nourisher to perfection, and Sustainer of all—* there is no need for another God, or for Him to create another like Himself. While Muslims believe that Allāh, God, is All-powerful, Allāh, God, will not do anything. This is made clear from His statement:

“It is not vouchsafed to a mortal that
Allah should speak to him except
by revelation (as an inspiration) or
from behind a veil (as in a dream or vision),
or by sending a messenger
(as the Angel Gabriel)”
(Qur'an 42:51).

Allāh, God, speaking from behind a veil does not mean that He wears a “purdah.”

28. “When we decreed that the Kaba is sacred, you should go to Abraham’s place for prayers.” (Qur'an 2:125).

The Swami argues, “Had not God appointed sacred place before He sanctified Kaba? If he had where was the necessity of consecrating Kaba? But if He had not, it is indeed a pity that those who were born before that period had to go without a holy place. Perhaps it had not struck God to consecrate a place like Kaba before that”–(LOT, p. 663).

(Since God revealed the Vedas to only four people in India— “Agni, Vayu, A'ditya and Angira”—as the Swami wrote, those people in Africa, Europe, North America, South America and elsewhere did not have the Vedas. It “is indeed a pity” that those people “had to go without a holy” Book).

Allāh, God, instructed Moses to remove his shoes because he was “in the sacred valley of Tuwa”–(Qur'an 20:12). Allāh, God, gave all peoples acts of worship. Any place where the worship of God is practiced is a consecrated place. To pray at the place where Abraham offered his prayers is one such act of worship for Muslims.

Allah gave man instructions according to his time and situation. As such there was no deficiency in the worship of those who passed away before the consecrating of the Ka'ba. The Ka'ba is made a station for all mankind in keeping with Allah God's purpose. Now, through the Prophet Mohammad, He has completed His favor to man and perfected religion for us: for all mankind to follow one religion—Islam; one Revelation—Qur'an; and one universal station of worship—the Ka'ba.

In fact the Ka'ba was consecrated way back in the time of Abraham as the verse shows–(Qur'an 2:125; also vs. 127). And Allāh says: “And who forsakes the religion of Abraham but he who makes a fool of himself”–(Qur'an 2:130). And the religion of Abraham –and the everlasting covenant between Abraham and God– is one of circumcision. And Hindus do not practice circumcision.

29. “And who but he that hath debased his soul to folly will dislike the faith of Abraham, when we have chosen him in this world, and in the world to come he shall be of the Just.”–(Qur'an 2:130).

The Swami questions “Now can it ever be true that he who does not like the faith of Abraham is a fool? Why did God choose Abraham alone (as the founder of the true faith)?” (LOT, p. 663).

What is the religion of Abraham? The religion of Abraham is *Islam*—Submission to the Will of Allāh, God. Isn’t this what the Swami (and all Hindus, as well as other religionist’s) profess to be doing—following the commands of God? Whoever does not follow the commands of God, is he not a fool? So where then is the problem in Allāh, God, declaring: “And who forsakes the religion of Abraham but he who makes himself into a fool”?

However, that which are passing under the name of God has no basis in Divine Scripture—the doctrines of *reincarnation* and *karma* are “very obscure” and “new and strange ones.” (See HINDUISM).

Scriptures prior to the Qur'an are not of “pristine purity.” Abdul Haque Vidyarthi points out:

“The Masorah and Septuagint versions of the old Testa-ment, the different authorized editions of the Sadducees and Pharisees, the apocryphal literature believed as part of inspired scriptures by some sects and rejected by others, the different versions of apocryphal Gospels, prove the credibility of the fact that no religious scripture was kept intact or properly maintained or committed to memory in the lifetime of the prophet to whom it was revealed.” And, in the passage of time: “the Vedas grew from one into four, and then from four to as many as 1131, there is a verse in Maha Bhashya which explains that there are one hundred and one shoots of Yajurveda, one thousand of Samaveda, twenty-one kinds of Rigveda and nine of Atharvaveda”. (Two quotes, *Muhammad in World Scriptures*, Vol. 1, p. 315).

Abdul Haque also notes that, “Buddha left no book or scripture after him”, and continued that, “Nevertheless Buddhists believe that the disciples of Buddha committed to memory all that he said, and before his teachings were written down they were honestly narrated.”(pp. 291-292).

Regarding the Zoroastrian scriptures, Abdul Haque wrote that, “the Parsis abandoned their religious laws and that “Covenant of Fire”, which was then reduced to mere worship of Fire, was totally forsaken by them (Epistles of Sasan I and Sasan V in Dasatir). Their religious scriptures having been thrown in the background were either destroyed by the sacking of Parsis by the Greeks or were tampered with so that today they are regarded only as the ruins of a religion.

“As the Parsis are a ruin of a people so are
their sacred books the ruins of a religion.”

(Sacred Books of the East, Vol. IV,
Introduction page, 11-12). ”

Abdul Haque also noted: “Many base and indecent things regarding women were introduced by Mazda in the Zoroastrian faith. But Anushirvan the Just, being influenced by the teachings of Islam, removed these abuses.” (pp. 128, 132).

And Anoop Chandola wrote about the Vedas: “The Indo-European people who began to enter the Indian subcontinent,” their “language, rich in oral literature, was called Sanskrit,” and that “the Aryan priests collected the oral verse in a book known as the *Rig Veda*. Each of the ten volumes, probably completed over several hundred years,” and that “Three more Vedas were added: *Yajur Veda*, *Sama Veda*, and *Atharva Veda*. The Vedas are called *shrutis*; that is, they were heard as heard by others through oral transmission.” (*The Way To True Worship*, pp. 7, 9.).

Regarding the Old Testament, Maurice Bucaille wrote that it “is a collection of works” which “were written in several languages over a period of more than nine hundred years, based on oral traditions” and that “men manipulated the texts to please themselves, according to the circumstances they were in and the necessities they had to meet.”

About the Gospels Mr. Bucaille noted that “the foremost authority was the oral tradition as a vehicle for Jesus’ words and the teachings of the apostles.” That “It was not until circa 170 A.D. that the four Gospels acquired the status of canonic literature.” And that “the authors of the Gospels were not eye-witnesses of the data they recorded.” (*The Bible, The Qur'an and Science*, pp. 7, 9, 77, 249).

Regarding the manner in which the Qur'an was transmitted to us, upon its revelation to Mohammad, “Believers learned it by heart. It was also written down during Muhammad's life,” says Mr. Bucaille. And that “Since then, we know that the text has been scrupulously preserved. It does not give rise to any problems of authenticity.” (*Ibid*; p. 250,251).

Allāh, God, declares that the protection of the Qur'an from human interference is with Him: “Surely on Us rests the collecting of it and the reciting of it”–(Qur'an 75:17). The Qur'an, which was both memorized and written down at the time of its revelation, is the Criterion that Allāh, God, has given to us to distinguish between Truth and Falsehood in religions –(Qur'an 2:185; 25:1; 98:1-3). The followers of other religions have nothing to lose by embracing Islam; and everything to gain as revealed by Allāh, God, in His Qur'an.

After the Qur'an there is no other scripture that can give more information regarding the moral, social, spiritual and intellectual development of man; and of knowledge of nature, heaven and hell, the soul and life and death; the Resurrection; the Day of Judgment and the Unity of God. Thus, Islam—obedient to the law of Allah God—is the true religion with Allāh, God–(Qur'an 3:18).

30. “We have seen thee turning towards every part of Heaven; but we will have thee turn to Kibla which shall please thee. Turn then thy face towards the sacred Mosque, and wherever ye be, turn your face, towards that part”–(Qur'an 2:144).

“Now is this trivial idolatry? We should think, it is the crudest form of idolatry,” the Swami wrote. And that Hindu worshippers of idols “do not regard the image as God. They profess to worship God behind the image,” he states. (LOT, p. 663).

Muslims do not concentrate on the Ka'ba, nor worship God behind the Ka'ba. To compare the Muslims facing the Ka'ba, having no semblance to any living being whatever, to the statues of Hindu worship is absurd. Unlike the Ka'ba each Hindu statue is of a different feature and form. Unlike the Ka'ba, statues are offered food and flowers, and fed milk.

To entertain that Mohammad who, from a minority of one, fought tooth and nail and endured all kinds of sufferings to stamp out idolatry in all its forms, would upon his triumph insti-tute idolatry, is a reasoning unbefitting any thinking individual.

Islam is the Universal religion. Allāh, God, now unites man in one religion. Facing the Ka'ba is symbolic of this oneness of the Muslim brotherhood—One God, *Allah*; one Book, *the Qur'an*; one Qibla/station of worship, the *Ka'ba*. This oneness among Muslims is demonstrated at least five times daily.

The Swami also quotes part of Qur'an 2:115 “Whichever way ye turn, there is the face of God” (which is taken out of context) and says, “If this be true, why the Mohammedans turn their face towards Qibla (i.e. the sacred Mosque at Mecca)?If God has a face, it can only be in one direction and not in all directions at one and the same time.” (LOT, p. 662).

Face (of God) here means “*purpose*” (of God). Verse 2:115, read in full with verse 114, shows that the “idolatrous Quraish had turned the Muslims out of the Sacred Mosque at Makkah and the Jews and the Christians were now helping them to annihilate the small Muslim community in Madinah, which practically meant the laying waste of the Sacred Mosque itself.” Whereas 2:114 “predicts disgrace” for these persecutors of Muslims, verse 115 “predicts the Muslim conquests by which the enemy was to be disgraced.” The Muslims “who had been deprived of all they possessed and made utterly destitute, were promised ample gifts. The words *whither you turn, thither is Allah's purpose*, points clearly to the Divine promise that all obstacles in the path of the Muslims will be removed and victory will follow their footsteps.

The word *wajh* occurring here (*in verse 115 above, quoted by the Swami*) denotes *countenance* or *face*, as well as *course*, *purpose*, or *object* which one is pursuing, or a *direction* in which one is going or looking—(Taj al-Arus [Dictionary], by Imam Muhibb al-Din Abu-l-Faid Murtada; Arabic English Lexicon by Edward William Lane). According to Raghib it signifies *atten-tion* or *course*.—(Muhammad Ali, Qur'anic comm. 159, 160).

32. “God is severe in chastising. Follow not the steps of Satan, He only enjoineth upon you evil and wickedness and that ye should aver of God that which ye know not.” (Qur'an 2: 167-169).

If Allāh, God, “has created Satan just to try man, it cannot be right, because only one who is possessed of finite knowledge would do such a thing; while One who is Omniscient is already aware of the good or evil deeds of the soul,” the Swami wrote. (LOT, pp. 664 -665).

Since the Hindu God is Omniscient and is “aware of the good or evil deeds of the soul,” why does He have man take countless births and deaths and into various kingdoms of creatures? He should just take the souls and put them permanently into bodies of creatures according to His knowledge of their “good or evil deeds.” There would be no need then for the Hindu God to hold judgment (of reincarnation).

Also, God is said to have revealed the Veda(s) to be taught to the world. But in the nearly two billion years since the revelation of the Veda(s) very few people know it or its language, compared to those who know the Bible and the Qur'an. Could it then be said that the Hindu God is not Omniscient because others follow the Bible/Qur'an? And that Mohammad who is said to have written the Qur'an for his own “selfish ends”, and whose

followers know the Qur'an from memory, and has more followers than Hinduism, is Omniscient above the Hindu God?

And as the Hindu God need "spies" He is not Omniscient.

33. The Swami quotes Qur'an 2:173, which forbids as food animals that "dies of itself , and blood, and the flesh of swine," etc.

He wrote, "Swine's flesh is forbidden (but not human flesh), shall we then conclude that it is right to eat human flesh?" and "May be, it is permissible to the Mohammedans to eat other animals, creeping insects and ants, etc;" (LOT, pp. 665, 675).

It is puzzling that the Swami should come to such a conclusion, when he himself quotes the Qur'an 8:69 as saying: "Eat therefore of what ye have acquired, that which is lawful and good"—(LOT, p. 681). And when Allah God says: "eat the lawful and **good things** from what is in the earth"—(Qur'an 2:168); "eat of the **good things** that We have provided you with, and give thanks to Allah if He it is Whom you serve"—(Qur'an 2:172). Clearly, Muslims cannot eat of the earth things that are not "good" and "lawful."

Allāh, God, tells us that backbiting is like eating the flesh of one's dead brother—(Qur'an 49:12). Clearly, since backbiting is like cannibalism, how much more loathsome is the eating of dead "human flesh."

Incidentally, since the God of the Vedas did not seem to make any distinction between what is good to eat and what is forbidden, as the God of the Qur'an has, then according to the Swami Hindus can eat anything.

34. On the nights during the fasting month, Muslims are allowed to have intimate relations with their wives—(Qur'an 2:187). The Swami remarks, "Now what kind of fast is it to eat during the night and abstain from food during the day? It is contrary to the laws of nature to take one's food during the night and abstain from it during the day." (LOT, p. 666).

(What about the millions who work night shifts: sleeping during the day and eat and work at nights?)

Eating at dawn and at sunset can hardly be considered as night. A person can eat at any hour of the night, so long as he/she does not over-eat. As the Prophet Mohammad has taught, the worse vessel that the son of Adam can fill is his stomach: one third space is for food, one third for drink, and one third for air, he says.

The benefits of the Muslim fast are fourfold—physiological, physical, moral and spiritual:

(a) The *physiological* benefits of fasting are many, such as regenerate the organs, eliminate toxins and purify the blood, improve health.

(b) The *physical* benefit of fasting: it makes us experience the hunger of the starving; it conditions us to endure long periods without food, drink, and to control carnal passions.

(c) The *moral* benefit of fasting: it makes us more aware of God as one is more likely to be conscious of God when suffering or in distress. Also, one who voluntarily gives up those things which are lawful will not (or should not) indulge in those things that are unlawful, for instance, eating pork, gambling, intoxicants, illicit relations.

(d) The *spiritual* benefit of fasting: because of one's constant remembrance of Allāh, it brings (or should bring) him/her closer to Allāh, God.

A wife is referred to as tilth because she is a producer of fruit (*a child*).

39. "Who is he that will lend to God a goodly loan? He will double it to him again and again"—(Qur'an 2:245). "Now why should God take a loan? Does He, who has created the whole universe, stand in need of taking a loan from men?" asks the Swami. And, "It seems that the Mohammedan God must have been reduced to poverty, otherwise why would He have asked for a loan and tempted them by saying that He would free them from their sins and send them to heaven. It appears that Mohammad gained his selfish ends by defrauding others in the name of God." —(LOT, pp. 667-668, 676).

(And what "selfish ends" are they? Mohammad lived a life of chastity, put his life at the forefront of battles, cobbled his shoes, mend his clothes, had no wealth, a bed of palm leaves, prayed half the night, and when he died his shield was in the possession of a "Jewish pawn-broker").

Lending a "loan" to God is only a figurative expression meaning to strive/spend in the way of God, and in return will receive a generous reward in the life to come. Perhaps every devotee of every religion must have offered to God a beautiful loan. Even the Swami must have offered God this loan with the expectation of being reincarnated into a higher kingdom of beings.

41. "Whatever exists on the earth or in the sky is for Him; His chair has, as it were, occupied all earth and space" —(Qur'an 2:255).

God "must be localised indeed when He has got a chair, but such a Being can never be God as he is All-pervading," states the Swami. (LOT, p. 668).

While everything has been created for man's use, everything in creation belongs to Allāh, God. The Arabic word *kursi* (of the verse under discussion) means *knowledge, chair* or *throne*, as Muhammad Ali explains. The significance of it in this verse (which is only a partial quote) is: "His (Allah God's) knowledge extends over the heavens and the earth, and the preservation of them both tires Him not"—(Q. 2:255).

In His Qur'an 7:54 Allah tells us, "He is established on the Throne of Power." The Arabic word here is *Arsh*. And Muhammad Ali notes: "*Arsh* literally means *a thing constructed for shade* (LL), or *anything roofed* (R). According to the latter authority *the court or sitting place of the king* is called '*arsh*' on account of its eminence. And he adds: It is used to indicate *might* or *power* and *authority* and *dominion*. LL accepts the interpretation of R, who says that "the '*arsh*' of God is one of the things which mankind know not in reality but only by name, and it is not as the imaginations of the vulgar hold it to be". In fact, both the words '*arsh*' and *kursi* have been misunderstood as meaning resting-places for Allah." The "true significance of '*arsh*' is power or control of the creation." (Qur'anic comm. 895).

Allah God being "established on the Throne of Power" means He is *in power* or *in control of the creation*.

(Muhammad Ali's translation of the Qur'an –which is a King Solomon's mine of knowledge– with text, commentary and notes can be viewed inline: www.muslim.org).

42. In His Qur'an 2:258 Allāh, God, recounts the incident between Abraham and the king, in which Abraham challenged the king (Nimrod): "Surely Allah causes the sun to rise from the East, so do thou make it rise from the West. Thus he (Nimrod) who disbelieved was confounded. And Allah guides not the unjust people."

"O what an ignorance!" says the Swami, "The sun does not rise in the East and set in the West, nor does it rise in the West and set in the East. It moves on its own axis. Now it is positively certain that the author of the Quran knew neither Astronomy nor Geography."—(LOT, p. 668)

If we institute the Swami's premise that the sun does not rise in the East etc; there would be no East and West and North and South. Mankind would be in total loss for direction.

From a visual and geographical perspective the sun does rise and set. The Swami himself says that "when it is sunrise in India, it is sunset in America and vice versa;" and that "the earth moves from west to east, whilst the moon from east to west." The Swami also quotes the Vaisheshika Shastra II, ii, 14, as saying: "That direction in which the sun is first seen to rise is called *East*, where it sets, is *West*."—(LOT, pp. 270, 418, 61, resp.). And the Rig Veda says: "**East, west, and north, let the King slay the foeman...**" (III. LIII. 11. Vol. 1, p. 397).

However, as noted, it was not Allāh, God, who said the sun rises in the East, but only that Allāh was recounting what Abraham said to the king. In any event this designation of "east" and "west" etc. is only a standard of uniformity for the benefit of man.

Allāh, God, not guiding the unjust people only means that He does not guide such people until or unless they themselves seek guidance. Allah has shown man the paths of evil and goodness. The choice is his to make. Allāh, God, does not change the condition of a people unless they change it—(Qur'an 13:11), that is to say, when they make the effort to change to goodness Allāh, God, helps them.

43. "He (Allāh, God) said (to Abraham), "Take thou four birds and draw them towards thee, and cut them in pieces; then place a part of them on every mountain; then call them and they shall come swiftly to thee"—(Qur'an 2:260).

"Now is not the Mohammadan God more like a juggler show-ing his tricks? Does His Godhead rest on such things? The wise will keep aloof from such a God, it is the ignorant alone who will be caught in His trap. (The Mohammadan) God will thus, instead of enhancing His reputation, bring disgrace on Himself", wrote the Swami—(LOT, p. 669).

The beginning of the verse under discussion shows that Abraham was inquiring from Allāh, God, to "Show me how Thou givest life to the dead," whereby Allāh instructs him to take the four birds etc.

The Qur'anic text does not say to "cut" the bird in pieces, but "tame" them. Yusuf Ali translates the verse as: "Take four birds; tame them to turn to thee; put a portion of them on every hill, and call to them: They will come to thee (Flying) with speed. Then know that God is Exalted in Power, Wise."

Muhammad Ali and Malik Ghulam Farid have translated similarly. Yusuf Ali explains that "we are shown the power of wisdom and love: if man can tame birds so that they know him and fly to him, how much more will God's creatures obey His call at the Resurrection?"

And regarding the statement “*a portion of them*” (from the instruction) “put a portion of them (the birds) on every hill,” Yusuf Ali comments:

“The received Commentators understand this to mean that the birds were to be cut up and pieces of them were to be put on the hills. The cutting up or killing is not mentioned, but they say that is implied by an ellipsis, as the question is how God gives life to the dead. Of the modern Muslim Commentators, M.P. is non-committal, but H.G.S. and M.M.A. understand that the birds were not killed, but that a “portion” here means a unit, single birds were placed on hills, and they flew to the one who tamed them. This last view commends itself to me, as the cutting up of the birds to pieces is nowhere mentioned, unless we understand the word for “taming” in an unusual and almost impossible sense.” (Comm. 306, 308).

Muhammad Ali has taken this verse under discussion to be a figurative expression. For his in-depth explanation see his translation of the Qur'an, viewed online at: www.muslim.org). Significantly, it is not stated if Abraham did as Allāh instructed.

48. Allāh, God, tells Muslims not to take disbelievers for friends rather than believers” – (Qur'an 3:27). (LOT, p. 670). This verse was revealed at a time when the Muslims were in a state of war with the disbelievers. As such they were “forbidden to look to their enemies to guard their interests or for help of any kind,” explains Muhammad Ali. The reason is obvious. Possible treachery. No sane person(s) would, under such a situation, take the word of those against him. In general, Muslims are counseled not to let non-Muslims into their affairs—be it personal or national. This does not prevent Muslims from having good relations with non-Muslims; Allah God says in Qur'an 60:8-9: “**Allah forbids you not respecting those who fight you not for religion, nor drive you forth from your homes, that you show them kindness and deal with them justly. Surely Allah loves the doers of justice.**” “**Allah forbids you only respecting those who fight you for religion, and drive you forth from your homes and help (others) in your expulsion, that you make friends of them; and whoever makes friends of them, these are the wrongdoers.**” It is doubtful that non-Muslims would let Muslims in on their private national or personal affairs. Why then should Muslims let non-Muslims in on their affairs?

49. “O Mary! Verily hath God chosen thee and purified thee and chosen thee above the women of the world!” –(Qur'an 3:41).

To which the Swami says: “Now how can we believe that God and His angels came down to talk with men in ancient times when they do not do so now-a-days? If it be argued that then the people were virtuous, it cannot be true. The fact of the matter is that at that time the majority of the people were uncivilized and ignorant, hence it was that such religions as the Christian and the Mohammadan, which are so opposed to the dictates of knowledge,* took root and flourished. But now the people are enlightened, these hollow faiths cannot flourish; on the other hand, they are on the decline.” (LOT, p. 671)

*(*Islam* “opposed to the dictates of knowledge”???) Wonder which Qur'an the Swami has been reading. Could not have been the one revealed by Allāh, God.

Islam enjoins the acquiring of knowledge. Instead of bring in decline Islam has surpassed Hinduism in number of devotees, and Islam is only 1400 years old contrasted with Hinduism which is claimed to be two billion years old).

If in the beginning, when man was at his crudest, God can find four men who were “purest in heart,” as the Swami says, to reveal to them the Vedas, then surely just before the beginning of our era, when man was so much more civilized, God could have found, at least, one woman, Mary, who was “virtuous.”

Angels coming to Mary was not a literal happening. Only a vision: “angels are not seen by the physical eye,” as Muhammad Ali notes—(Qur’anic comm. 1536).

Christianity and Islam whose doctrines –Resurrection and Judgment– are clearly expressed teachings could not be “hollow faiths,” compared to Hinduism’s belief – karma and reincarnation– which are not clearly expressed doctrines. If at all.

Allāh, God, from Whom comes only good and Who gives guidance, could not be said to lead astray, or deceive, or be a “trickster.”

In the Qur'an 19:16-22 Allāh, God, recounts the angels announcing the birth of Jesus to Mary, and her subsequent conception. To which the Swami comments: “Mary while she was a Virgin, gave birth to a son, although she did not like to co-habit with any man, yet contrary to her wishes she was conceived by the angel at the Lord's command. Now how wrong it was of God to have done so! There are many other objectionable things recorded in the Qur'an which we do not think advisable to mention here.” (LOT, p. 692).

(It is a pity the Swami chose not to mention these “objectionable things”).

Mary was not “conceived by the angel.” It is a rather strange conclusion of the Swami that Mary was conceived “contrary to her wishes”. All Mary said was: “How can I have a son when no man has touched me, nor have I been unchaste,” (*meaning I am a virgin, and I am not inclined to acts that would lead to carnal relation*—Qur'an 19:20). It is doubtful that a devout woman having found such closeness to her Creator as to be chosen among all women of the world by Him, would refuse such a high honor to bear a child in His Divine plan.

The question may have been entertained as to how could Allāh, God, have made Mary conceive without a mate? Surely if Allah God can raise animals and plants from dirt, He could have had Mary conceive without a mate by raising a male reproductive cell within her body. As the Swami says (about God): “He caused the soul to enter the body and He Himself entered the soul thereafter”, and that “God, being Infinite and All-pervading, it can never be predicated of him that He can go in or come out. Coming and going can be possible only if it be believed that there are places where He is not. Then was not God already present in the womb...?” (LOT, pp. 227, 220).

As God was “already present in the womb,” as the Swami states, it was even easier for Him to have Mary conceive without a mate. Again, since “He (God) is able to make the visible universe out of invisible causes,” as the Swami wrote, He is just as much “able to make” Jesus out of “invisible causes”—(LOT, p. 208).

Also, the Swami quotes: “And remember her who preserved her virginity, and into whom we breathed our spirit.”—(Qur'an 21:91).

(Yusuf Ali, Muhammad Ali, and Malik Ghulam Farid translate the Arabic word *farj* to mean “chastity” instead of “virginity”).

“It is impossible that such obscene statements should have been recorded in Divine revelation or even in a book written by a decent man. When even human beings do not relish such writings, how can God do so? It is such statements as bring the Quran into disrepute. If its teachings had been good, it would have commanded admiration like the *Veda*,” the Swami wrote. (LOT, p. 693).

But there is no shame in dispensing knowledge. Wise parents would instruct their children on morality. They would not wait till their sons and daughters become unwed parents before instructing them in matters of sex. Islam is the total way of life for man – moral, social, intellectual, spiritual. It gives guidance in all aspects of our life. There is shame only in the abuse of knowledge.

However, whereas the Swami has criticized this statement of the Qur'an 21:91 “And remember her who preserved her virgin-ity and into whom we breathed our spirit,” as being “obscene,” he quotes the Rig Veda, which is claimed to have been revealed by God for all mankind, and Manu as saying, respectively:

“Let girls, who are **virgins,**
resembling cows
that have never been milked before....”
(Rig Veda, III, 55, 16) (LOT, p. 95)

“Certainly if the wife do not love
and please her husband, being unhappy
he will not be sexually excited....”

(Manu III, 61) (LOT, p. 109). (*Emphasis added 2x*).

And the Rig Veda says:
(“Indrani speaks with pride of her voluptuous charms
which incited Vrsakapi to his amorous assault”)

“No Dame hath ampler charms than I,
or greater wealth of love's delights.
None with more ardour offers all her beauty
to her lord's embrace.

Supreme is Indra over all.
Mother whose love is quickly won,
I say what verily will be.
My breast, O Mother, and my head
and both my hips seem quivering.
Supreme is Indra over all.”

(“Indra speaks”)

“Dame with the lovely hands and arms,
with broad hair-plaits add Ample hips,
Why, O thou Hero's wife,
art thou angry with our Vrsakapi?
Supreme is Indra over all.”

(X. LXXXVI. 6-9, notes 6, 8, Vol. 2, pp. 547, 548, 549).

Virginity is the natural state in which we are born. Thus, the Qur'anic *virginity* could hardly be “obscene;” even without comparing it to these inelegant expressions and eroticism of Manu and the Rig Veda.

Regarding the Swami's assertion that Islam is “opposed to the dictates of knowledge,” it is said that Muslims believe that the earth is supported “on the horns of a bull.”(LOT, p. 268).

Considering that Allah reveals that planets float in orbits—(Qur'an 21:33; 36:40), I wonder from which Muslims the Swami received this view. Perhaps from the Hindu reverts to Islam, who brought beliefs of Hinduism into Islam.

As stated, Islam enjoins the seeking of knowledge (Qur'an 20:114). And the Prophet Mohammad exhorted Muslims to ‘seek knowledge from the cradle to the grave;’ to go to China if need be—(Baihaqi) Mishkat Misabih, Vol. 1, p. 361, #111 W); and that ‘the superiority of the learned scholar over the pious worshipper is like the superiority of the (full) moon over the stars’—(Abu Dawud Vol. 3, p.1034, # 3634).

51. “Is it not enough for you that your Lord aideth you with three thousand angels sent down from on high?” —(Qur'an 3:123).

The Swami argues: “If God really aided the Mohammedans with three thousand angels in the past, why does He not help them now that their rule (in India and other countries) has greatly declined and is till declining? The real object of this verse is to tempt the ignorant and thereby ensnare them into the Mohammedan religion.”(LOT, p. 671).

Yet, regarding the victory of Mahmud of Ghazni over the Hindus, the Swami chastised the Hindus as to: “Why did they not worship the Almighty God whereby they would have put the barbarians, to rout and gained a victory over them? Had they worshipped heroes and brave men in place of all those idols, what a protection they would have afforded them.”(LOT, p. 391).

So if the Hindus worshipped God and “heroes and brave men” they would have gotten His help, but the Muslims cannot receive help from Allah God? Wonder if the Hindu God really aid Hindus, or if the Swami only lectured this “to tempt the ignorant and thereby ensnare them into the” Hindu/Vedic religion? (LOT, p. 671). (**How could God have aided the Hindus when the Hindus are subjected to karma? And if Hindus are subjected to karma what need is there for God and praying to God?**)

52. “And help us against the unbelieving people. But God is your real Lord, and He is the best of helpers. And if ye shall be slain or die on the path of God.”—(Qur'an 3:146, 147, 157).

“Now reader mark the error of the Mohammadans!” says the Swami, “They pray for the destruction of those who differ from them in religious opinions. Is God such a simpleton that he will grant their prayer? If God is the best helper of the Mohammadans only, why should they fail in their undertakings?” (LOT, pp. 671-672).

But this line of 3:146 is taken out of context. When this verse 3:146 is viewed in its context (from verse 145) it shows that this was the prayer for help against the disbelieving people of prophets before the Prophet Mohammad.

Since Allah says that all religions are for Him—(Qur'an 8:39), such prayers for help are against those disbeliever who persecute Muslims. There is no person who can honestly

say that he does not wish for the destruction of his persecutors and occupiers. In fact the Rig Veda—(VII. XXXIII. 25. Vol. 2, p. 37) says:

“Drive thou away our enemies,
O Maghavan:
make riches easy to be won.
Be thou our good Protector
in the strife for spoil:
Cherisher of our friends be thou.”

This call by the Hindus is, evidently, “for the destruction of those who differ from them in religious opinions.” The Swami himself prayed: “**May the Omniscient Ruler of all sow the seed of true religion in all hearts, whereby all false religions and false doctrines may soon perish!**”—(**Ameen!**) (LOT, p. 327).

Clearly, this prayer of the Swami to “perish” “all false religions and false doctrines” is a prayer for help against those who *disbelieve* in the Swami’s religion.

And for the Puranics writings, which the Swami states are “falsehood,” the Swami lamented, (LOT, pp. 406-407): “**Oh! Why did not the writers of *Bhagvat* and other *Puranas* die in their mothers’ wombs or as soon as they were born?**”

Isn’t this a prayer for “the destruction of those who differ from them (the Swami) in religious opinions”?

It is acceptable for a Vedic/Hindu to pray for the destruction of their enemies and unacceptable for a Muslim to pray for the destruction of his enemies?

How could they die in their “mothers’ wombs” when they must have had good karma in order to return as humans? And in writing “falsehood” were they not fulfilling karma –others having duped them in a past life for them to now dupe others with “falsehood”?

It would seem to be a sin to pray for another to die in his mother’s womb or as soon as they were born, when God has returned this soul as a human being, according to his karma.

Regardless of the time period, Allāh, God, always helps His believers, be he a Hindu, Jew, Christian, Muslim or other. Belief in God is not mere lip service. Belief in Allāh, God, is of both faith and good deeds. One cannot expect the help of Allāh, God, through mere belief in Him. If all believers in Allah God –Hindu, Jew, Christian, Muslim and others– were living the Commandments of Allāh, God, there would be no transgression against the other.

However, Muslims are not to pray for the destruction of his opponents—(Qur'an 3:127), only for their defeat—(Qur'an 2:2:86; 3:146). And only when Muslims are not the aggressors; Allah God does not aid the wrong-doers.

57. “When they come forth from Thy presence, a party of them broods by night over other than thy words; but God writeth down what they brood over.”—(Qur'an 4: 81).

Allah God writing down our deeds only means that our actions are recorded by our own limbs, hence our limbs being called to give evidence against us, in the Hereafter.

That Allāh, God, “lead astray.” Muhammad Ali has also pointed out the error in the belief that Allah God “*leads astray*.”

“A great misconception regarding the teachings of the Qur'an is that it ascribes to God the attribute of leading astray. Nothing could be farther from the truth. While *al-Hadi*

or the *One Who guides*, is one of the ninety-nine names of Allah, as accepted by all Muslims, *al-Mudzill*, or *the One Who leads astray*, has never been recognized as such. If *leading astray* were an attribute of God, as *guiding* certainly is, the name *al-Mudzill* should have been included in the list of His names, as *al-Hadi* is. But the Qur'an, which repeatedly says that God's are all the excellent names, could not ascribe to Him what it has plainly ascribed to the Devil, *viz.*, the leading astray of men.It is impossible that God, Who is so solicitous for the guidance of man, should Himself lead him astray. Guiding and leading astray are two contradictions which could not be gathered together in one being." "The mistaken idea that God leads people astray arises out of a misconception of the meaning of the word *idzlal* when it is ascribed to God." (*The Religion of Islam*, pp. 323, 324, 325).

58. "If they do not withhold their hands, seize them, and slay them, wherever you find them. A believer killeth not a believer but by mischance, and whoso killeth a believer by mischance shall be bound to free a believer from slavery; and the blood money shall be made to the family of the slain believer unless they convert it into alms. But if the slain believer be of a hostile people, let him confer freedom on a slave who is a believer. But whoever shall kill a believer of a set purpose, his recompense shall be hell, for ever shall he abide in it, God shall be wrathful with him."—(Qur'an 4:91-93). (LOT, p. 673)

These verses are used out of context. Only those disbelievers who were at war with the Muslims were to be seized and killed. Verse 90 says clearly: "So if they withdraw from you and fight you not and offer you peace, then Allah allows you no way against them."

Regarding the verse on murder and blood-money, the Swami has omitted a part of verse 92, which says that if the slain person is from a tribe "between whom and you there is a covenant, the blood money should be paid to his people along with the freeing of a believing slave."

The tribe(s) that had a covenant with the Muslims was non-Muslim. Since Muslims were required to pay blood-money as well as free a believing slave for killing one of these non-Muslims, there is no "prejudice" as the Swami contends. It was a practice of the hostile tribes to have members pretend a belief in Islam and request Muslims to join them to become their teachers in religion. When this was accomplished they would kill the Muslims.

However there still remains the injunction that if the slain person is a believer of a hostile tribe, to only free a believing slave, but no payment is to be made. Is this "prejudice? Absolutely not! Paying money to a people who is at war with you only fortifies their strength against you. And Allāh, God, is All-knowing, Wise.

When there is no state of war, "retaliation is prescribed for you in the matter of the slain: the free for the free, and the slave for the slave, and the female for the female. But if remission is made to one by his (aggrieved) brother, prosecution (for blood-wit) should be according to usage, and payment to him in a good manner"—(Qur'an 2:178).

60. Allah God says in His Qur'an 4:136, "And whoever disbelieve in Allah and His angels and His Books and His messen-gers and the Last Day, he indeed strays far away."

The Swami states: "Can you ever now assert that God is one without a second? Is it not self-contradictory to call God Incom-parable and yet at the same time believe that there are others who share Divine privileges with Him?"(LOT, p. 674).

Does a person believing in an Indian Ambassador makes that Ambassador the Indian Prime Minister, or gives that Ambassador equal status with the Prime Minister? These angels and prophets are servants of Allāh, God, believing in them to be from God does not give them “Divine” status or partnership with God.

According to Hinduism God, matter, and soul are eternal. How then can the Hindu God be claimed to be Incomparable? How could the Hindu God be Incomparable when there are many who are worshipped along with Him? It is, in the words of the Swami, “self-contradictory” to call the Hindu “God Incomparable and yet at the same time believe that there are others who share Divine privileges with Him.”

66. “Obey God and obey the apostle”–(Qur'an 5:92).

The Swami opines: “This goes to show that God is not “One without a second,” hence it is absurd for the Mohammedans to believe that it is otherwise.”(LOT, p. 676).

(The people of a country “obey” the Leader as well as “obey” the ministers and police and priests etc. Does this mean that the Leader has a “second” in his Leadership?

Muslims are also required to believe in all prophets of Allāh, God–(Qur'an 3:178). We are also required to obey those in authority among us–(Qur'an 4:59). Prophets are the Ambassadors of Allāh, God. They are our link to Allah. We obey Allah by following His Revelation. And as the Prophet explains the Qur'an, we obey him by following his instructions, e.g. Allah enjoins on us prayer and charity, but it is the Prophet who teaches us how to pray and what amount to give in charity and on what goods charity are required.

Mohammad is not God or deputy God.

In chapter 3 of the Qur'an, verse 178 ends with the statement: “Believe therefore, in God and in His apostles.” –(Please note the plural *apostles*). To which the Swami states, “If it be argued that this verse only teaches that people should have faith in Mohammad as a Prophet, we should like to know where is the necessity of Mohammad (being regarded as a Prophet). If God cannot accomplish His desired object without making him His Prophet, He is certainly powerless.”(LOT, p. 672).

Yet the Swami says: “In the beginning, God revealed the four *Vedas*, *Rig*, *Yaju*, *Sama* and *Atharva*, to *Agni*, *Vayu*, *A'ditya* and *Angira*, respectively.” (LOT, p. 236).

So in order for God to “accomplish” having the Vedas reach the Hindus, God **needed** these four men. In order for Hindus to accept the Vedas as being from God, Hindus **must believe** in these four men as being chosen by God. And as God **needed** these men and as Hindus **needed** to believe in these men, then, according to the Swami's logic, the Hindu God “is certainly powerless”, since He needed others to help Him “accomplish His desired object.”

Since the Hindu God needs “spies” and “artist,” as the Rig Veda says, He “is certainly powerless”:

“Varuna, wearing golden mail...
His spies are seated round about.”
(I. XXV. 13. Vol. 1, p. 35).

“He slew the Dragon lying on the mountain: his
heavenly bolt of thunder Tvastar fashioned”
 (“Tvastar is the artist of the Gods”–Griffith).

(I. XXXII. 2. Vol. 1, p. 46).

Because Mohammad's name is linked with Allah's in the declaration "There is no god but Allah, Mohammad is the Messenger of Allāh," does not mean that Mohammad is a partner with Allāh, God, nor is he "sharing homage" with Allah God. Through this association, Muslims are constantly reminded that Mohammad is not God, he is not son of God, and he is not partner with God; he is only the Messenger of God.

The Swami points out: "At one place the Quran says that God should be spoken to aloud, while at another place it says that He should be addressed "without loud spoken words." Now which of the two shall we believe to be true and which false? Self-contradictory statements can only be made by one who is demented." (LOT, p. 679).

There are no contradictions in the Qur'an. As the verse says avoid "loud" spoken words. This only means that one must not recite in a tone that is above normal. This is corroborated by chapter 17:110 which says, "And utter not thy prayer loudly nor be silent in it, and seek a way between these." Qur'an 7:55 says: "Call on your Lord humbly and in secret."

Muslims can call on Allāh, God, not only in any position –standing, sitting, and reclining– but also in any mode of expression—with voice or in silence. The Prophet Mohammad is the foremost interpreter of the Qur'an. Some prayers (and portions of prayer) he offered audibly and others, without sound.

76. "They will question thee about THE SPOILS, say: the spoils are God's and the apostle's. Therefore fear God."—(Qur'an 8:1).

The Swami: "It is very strange that those who plunder others and live by dacoity and teach others to do the same should still profess to be *God, prophet* and *the faithful*. These people with one breath plunder others and with the other talk of fearing God, and yet do not feel the least shame in declaring that their religious faith is the best. Can there be a man worse than one who through sheer obstinacy does not embrace the true *Vedic religion*?" (LOT, p. 679).

(As the Vedic religion also seeks "the spoils" and as its doctrines—karma and reincarnation—are shown to have no clear expression in the Vedas, "Can there be a man worse than one who through sheer obstinacy does not embrace the true Islamic religion, of which all of its articles of faith have clear expression in the Qur'an, and which has been shown to be superior to all religions?).

The Prophet and his followers did not "plunder" anyone! War was forced upon them. As has been proven time and again in preceding pages, Muslims are not allowed to be aggressors/transgressors.

What would the Swami and his followers suggest be done with the useful things remaining after a war—destroy it? Unless under extenuating circumstances, it is doubtful that any "enlightened" person, be he atheist or religionist, would destroy articles that are useful.

Four fifths of the war booty was divided among the soldiers, and the remaining one fifth is declared to be "for Allah and for the Messenger and for the near of kin and the orphans and the needy and the wayfarer"—(Qur'an 8:41). That Allah God is included in this share simply means that a part of this one fifth is to be spent in the spreading of the Message of Allah.

The Hindu king and soldier also have their share of war booty, as the Swami quotes Manu: “Let the king never violate this law that carriages, horses, elephants, tents, umbrellas, grain silver and gold, cattle such as cows, **women**, cases of oil and butter, and various other articles are lawful prize of the soldier or of the officer who takes them in war. The captors should give the sixteenth part of their loot to the king, and so should the latter distribute among the whole army the sixteenth part of what was taken by them collectively.”(LOT, pp. 175-176. Italics/Emphasis added).

And the Rig Veda says, (*Emphasis added*):

“Help us, O Indra, in the frays, yea, frays,
where thousand *spoils* are gained,
With awful aids, O awful One.
In mighty battle we invoke Indra,
Indra in lesser fight,
The Friend who bends his bolt at fiends.”
(I. VII. 4-5. Vol. 1, p. 10).

“Save us, our Charioteer, from harm, O Indra,
soon, very soon, make us win *spoil* of cattle.”

“Call we on Maghavan, auspicious Indra,
best Hero in this fight where *spoil* is gathered.
The strong who listens, who gives aid in battles,
who slays the Vrtras, wins and gathers riches.”
(III. XXXI. 20, 22. Vol. 1, p. 371).

“Indra, for our assistance bring that
most effectual power of thine,
Which conquers men for us, and wins
the *spoil*, invincible in fight.”

“For, Mightiest Vrtra-slayer, thee, fierce,
foremost among many, folk
Whose grass is trimmed invite to
battle where the *spoil* is won.

Indra, do thou protect our car that mingles
foremost in the fights,
That bears its part in every fray,
invincible and seeking *spoil*.”
(V. XXXV. 1, 6-7. Vol. 1, pp. 531-532).

“Drive thou away our enemies, O Maghavan:
make riches easy to be won.

Be thou our good Protector in the strife for *spoil*:
Cherisher of our friends be thou.”
(VII. XXXII. 25. Vol. 2, p. 37)

“O Soma Pavamana, find wealth for us
not to be assailed,
Wealth which the foeman may not win.

Send riches hither with thy stream in thousands,
both of steeds and kine,
Send *spoil* of war and high renown.”
(IX. LXIII. 11-12. Vol. 2, p. 335).

The Veda is devoted more to “spoil” of war rather than the Qur'an is. In fact the Hindu Gods also come in for a share of the “spoil” of war:

“May we get booty from our foe in battle,
presenting to the Gods their share
for glory”
(I. LXXIII. 5. Vol. 1, p. 105).

86. “Take alms of their substance, that thou mayest clean and purify them thereby, and pray for them: for thy prayers shall assure their minds. Verily, of the faithful hath God bought their persons and their substance on condition of Paradise for them, in return on the path of God shall they fight, and slay and be slain.” –(Qur'an 9:103, 111).

To which the Swami commented: “This is really fine! Mohammad here figures out as the very prototype of a *Popish* priest who *cleanse* or grants absolution only to those who grease his palm. This Moslim God is a wonderful trader, Who thinks He drives a roaring trade by taking the lives of the poor and helpless through the Mohammedans! By condemning the orphans to destruction and awarding paradise to the oppressors, the Mohammedan God becomes chargeable with cruelty and injustice and this is a blot on His Godhead. He has rightly come to be looked down upon with contempt by the wise and the noble-minded.”(LOT, p. 683).

Mohammad, the King of Arabia, wore coarse garments, had a bed made of palm leaves, mended his clothes and cobbled his own shoes, had a wooden staff for scepter, and when he died his shield was in the pawn shop—quite a lot of “grease (in) his palm”? Mohammad cannot “*cleanse* or grant absolution;” only Allāh, God, can.

The verse says that Mohammad is only to “pray” for them. If Mohammad was empowered to grant “absolution” there would be no necessity for him to “pray for them.” Taking alms (charity/zakaat) from the “substance” of the wealthy is for the benefit of the poor and the orphans, as well as to purify the giver—in that by giving freely of his possession he/she would be inclined to avoid the evil of robbing others, whether in business, trade, or any other dealing.

Muslims fighting in the way of Allah is a fight only against those who transgressed the limits set by Allah, as has been pointed out in this book. It is rather poor cerebration to surmise that Allāh, God, sanctions “taking the lives of the poor and help-less” and “condemning the orphans to destruction and awarding paradise to the oppressors,” when He tells Muslims not to be aggressive and to fight oppression—(Qur'an 2:190, 191, 193; 8:39), that oppressors would be punished severely—(Qur'an 42:42); to set right the affairs of the orphans—(Qur'an 2:220; 2:282; 4:2-3, 6, 10; 127; 6:153; 17:34); to take care of the poor—(Qur'an 9:60; 69:34; 89:18; 90:11-16; 107:1-3); and to fight on behalf of the weak—(Qur'an 4:75).

91. “And it was said, “O Earth! ‘Swallow up thy water’ and “Cease, O Heaven.” And the water abated. O my people! this is the she-camel of God and a sign unto you; let her go at large, and feed on God's Earth.”—(Qur'an 11:44, 64).

“What childish talk is this?” says the Swami. “Can the earth or the heavens ever hear? And if God possesses a she-camel, He must also possess a he-camel. ...Does God ever ride the she-camel. If such is the Muslim God, His house must be distinguished for all the pomp and splendour to be found in the house of a mundane potentate,” says the Swami. (LOT, p. 685)

It was not Allah God, but the prophet Salih, who says “This is the she-camel of God and a sign unto you” etc. Yes, every creation in the heavens and earth belongs to Allah—from the gnat to the gigantic orb; she-camel, he-camel, you and me, Swami and all.

Allāh, God, speaking to the earth and heavens does not mean that words were uttered; they are only to illustrate His power.

In the matter of the she-camel, Yusuf Ali narrates briefly the background to this camel being made a “sign” to the people. He explains: “that (1) she was a Sign or Symbol, which the prophet Salih used for a warning to the haughty oppressors of the poor; (2) there was scarcity of water, and the arrogant or privileged classes tried to prevent the access of the poor or their cattle to the springs, while Salih intervened on their behalf (Qur'an 26:155, 54:28); (3) like water, pasture was considered a free gift of nature, in this spacious earth of God—(7:73), but the arrogant ones tried to monopolise the pasture also; (4) this particular she-camel was made a test case—(54:27) to see if the arrogant ones would come to reason; (5) the arrogant ones, instead of yielding to the reasonable rights of the people, ham-strung the poor she-camel and slew her, probably secretly – (91:14, 54:29).”(Qur'anic comm. 1044).

92. “Therein shall they abide while the heavens and the earth shall last. And as for the blessed ones—their place the Garden! Therein shall they abide while the heavens and the earth endure.” –(Qur'an 11:107-108).

The Swami argues, “If, after the Day of Judgment, all people must repair either to heaven or hell, why should the earth or the sky then continue to exist? (*The Swami seems to believe that our creation will be the first and last*). And if heaven and hell or (are?) to endure as long as the earth and the sky endure, then it follows that the assertion “that they shall abide in heaven or hell for ever” is baseless. It is the ignorant that talk in this vain, and not the wise, or God.”(LOT, p. 685).

As noted elsewhere, Hell is not for ever. As for the gift of Paradise, it shall be “so long as the heavens and the earth endure, except as thy Lord please—a gift never to be cut off;” “Nor will they be ejected therefrom.”(Qur'an 11:108; 15:48).

As noted, our heaven and earth is not everlasting. This does not mean that there will not be other heavenly bodies. Scientists today are witnessing the destruction of heavenly bodies (such as supernova). Yet these destructions do not impact on others. The destruction of our heaven and earth would not affect Hell and Heaven.

93. “When Joseph said to his father, “O my father! verily I beheld eleven stars and the sun and the moon.”—(Qur'an 12:4).

The Swami says, “This verse contains a dialogue between a father and his son, which shows that the Quran is not from God but is the production of some man who has embodied in it the biographies of human beings.”(LOT, p. 685).

But Allah God is here recounting the story of Joseph. In this is a lesson for us.

94. “It is God who hath reared the heavens without pillars thou canst behold; then mounted His throne and imposed laws on the sun and the moon. And He it is who hath outstretched the earth. He sendeth down the rain from heaven; then flow the torrents in their due measure.”—(Qur'an 13: 2, 3, 17).

The Swami asserts: “The Muslim God is entirely innocent of all knowledge of Physical Science. Were He conversant with Physical Science, He would not have talked of rearing heavens on pillars. If God dwells in a particular locality or in the heavens, He cannot be Almighty or All-encompassing. (*Why not? Leaders of powerful countries does not have to go anyplace to know what is transpiring in distant lands; such powerful leaders, with the aid of satellites can tell who went where, who did what, who says what and with whom. And if man can have such sophis-ticated system of detection, consider how much more advanced would be the system of God*). Had the Muslim God known aught of the Science of the clouds, He would have coupled the words, “He made the water go up to the sky,” with the words, “He sendeth down the rain from heaven.” (*And He did, as will be shown*). This shows that the author of the Quran was ignorant of the science of clouds.” (LOT, p. 686).

Allāh speaking about the heavens being raised without pillars is only calling man's attention to the marvels of creation.

Regarding rainfall. As noted elsewhere, heat from the sun causes the water of the seas to evaporate. The water vapor rises and condenses and collects into clouds. Allāh says that He “sends forth the winds, so they raise a cloud, then He spreads it forth in the sky as He pleases, and He breaks it, so that you see the rain coming forth from inside it”—(Qur'an 30:48; also 35:9).

98. (Iblis not making obeisance to Adam, please see p. 24).

“If God breathed His spirit into Adam, then Adam also became God,” the Swami opines, “If Adam was not God, then why did God let him share the homage due to Him only?” (LOT, p. 687).

According to Hinduism/Vedism, as the Swami wrote, God “caused the soul to enter the body and He Himself entered the soul thereafter.” Does this mean that the soul or the object that the soul enters is God—seeing that God is inside the soul and the object?

God breathing His spirit into Adam does not make Adam “God”. The light of the sun comes into our houses, but the actual sun is not in our houses. And God did not let Adam “share the homage due to Him only.”

Allāh, God, could not be a “beguiler” when He gives man guidance and points out the ways of goodness and evil. Allāh, God, gives man a free choice in his destiny, if he allows Satan to beguile him he does so by his own hands not by Allah's. While Allah could have destroyed Satan instantly for his disobedience, Allah is Just and Merciful. He gives man respite to change from his evil ways.

The Swami wrote: “If God sent apostles to every country, why did He not send one to Aryavarta (India)? Hence this assertion of the Quran does not deserve to be given credence to.” (LOT, p. 687).

It is incredible that in the beginning God created “hundreds and thousands of men”, as the Swami wrote, yet in this very beginning, as God is said to have revealed the Veda, He could only find “four alone” who were “purest in heart” to whom He could reveal the

four Vedas. It is incredible that Allāh, God, Who is the Lord of all, would give guidance only to portions of mankind and disregard others.

Allāh, God, tells us that He raised messengers among all nations—which would include “*Aryavarta (India)*” —(Qur'an 10:47; 16:36; 35:24). Though not all of these messengers are mentioned—(Qur'an 4:164; 40:78); they all taught the people in their own language—(Qur'an 14:4), and considering the size of India and its many different languages one can imagine the number of Divine messengers that Allāh, God, has raised up in India. All these messengers taught one common doctrine:

“And We sent no messenger before
thee (Mohammad) but We revealed to him that
there is no God but Me, so serve Me
(Qur'an 21:25)

It is highly probable that all these righteous individuals of Hinduism who are worshipped as Gods were in fact prophets of God. Hanuman “the monkey-god who helped Rama....was a historic person who was afterwards deified (? deified);” (LOT, p. 24, f/n).

And Anoop Chandola explains: “The Vedas included several major gods and goddesses some of whom must have been culture heroes....As the tradition of honoring culture heroes continued, in due course new heroes were added, ***two of them most important: Rama and Krishna.***” (*The Way To True Worship*, p. 9. Italics/emphasis added).

Allāh saying “Be” and it is, has been dealt with elsewhere.

103. On the day of Judgment Allah God “shall call every people with their leader”—(Qur'an 17:71).

To which the Swami comments: “If God will call the Prophet and all his followers on the day of judgment in order to decide the fate of the dead, all of them will have to remain in custody till that period.....He will keep one man in custody for fifty years, while He will decide the case of another at once. Surely this cannot be called justice. (*But some dangerous criminals might consider this delay in justice a joy; especially those on death-row*). “Again, to hold that God summons the prophets as witness is to question His Omniscience. Can such a book ever be the Word of God and can its author ever be an Almighty God?” (LOT, pp. 689-690).

A person who is asleep would have no knowledge of how long he was asleep, if all evidence of time is removed from him. If he was asleep for a week it might seem to him as if he had slept only for an hour. So if one dead is not resurrected for a million years whereas another is resurrected after an hour it would make no difference to either of them (for their trial on the Judgment).

Allāh, God, calling man with his prophet on the Day of Judgment is not a question on His Omniscience. Allah is Just. And that man should be shown to be guilty by sources independent of His Omniscience—not only would man's limbs bear witness against himself—prophets will verify that they had brought Divine message to man. (*Even in this world even though man has been guilty through his own fingerprint and DNA, independent evidence is still sought against him. Even in this life criminals are brought to trial at*

a future appointed date. It is not the judge, but man's own peers, who bears testimony against him. (Qur'an 18: 80, 86, 94).

The Swami states: "How unwise of God! He feared lest the parents of the boy might be led to rebel against His authority. This cannot be compatible with the nature of God. Again mark the ignorance of the author of the Quran! He thinks that the sun sinks into a lake at night, and comes out of it again at day-break. As a matter of fact, the sun is very much larger than the earth. How can he then set in a river or a lake or an ocean? This proves that the author of the Quran was ignorant of Physical Geography and Astronomy. Had he known these Sciences why would he have written such things as are opposed to the dictum of knowledge? The believers in this book are also illiterate; other-wise they would not have believed in a book which is so full of error. Now mark God's injustice? Though He is Himself the Creator of this earth and is its King and Judge, yet He allows Gog and Magog wage constant war with each other. This is also incompatible with the nature of God. Such a book can only be believed in by savages and not by enlightened men." (LOT, p. 691).

(These verses are of two different topics that the Swami has conjoined together. Verse 80 is of an allegorical narration in the life of Moses, whereas verses 86 and 94 are from a historical event in the life of Dhul-qarnain).

The "we" in the verse "*we feared lest the youth should trouble his parents*," is not the words of Allah God, fearing "lest the parents of the boy might be led to rebel against His authority. They are the words of the companion of Moses. In this "we" the companion is, seemingly, associating himself with God in his actions, and hoping that the parents would be given a better son, as the verse following conveys: "So we desired that their Lord would give them in exchange (a son) better in purity (of conduct) and closer in affection"—(Qur'an 18:81).

The Swami teaches that revilers of the Vedas are to be "expelled out of the country", that writers of the Puranas should have "die(d) in their mothers' wombs or as soon as they were born", and that "It is the business of the State to punish or even kill all those men and animals that are injurious (to the community)—(LOT pp. 50; 406-407; 323). Why then should an incorrigible son not be killed for leading his parents away from God, Who is the Creator of all and Who is worthy of all honor?

In this narration there are three incidents associated with Moses: the damage to a boat, the slaying of a youth, and repairing a wall, which Muhammad Ali says: "the incidents seem no more than prophetic allegories of Moses' own life-work;" (*and he gave potent reasons and concludes*), "Read in this light, the narration is clearly an Ascension of Moses, foreshadowing the great events which were to befall him." (See Muhammad Ali's translation of the Qur'an online: www.muslim.org).

About Dhul-qarnain: Not even the "savages" of Seventh Century Arabia attributed such an absurd meaning to the verse that the sun literally "sinks into a lake at night". What the verse is conveying is that Dhul-qarnain's travels had taken him to a large body of water in the west. As Muhammad Ali explains: "*Maghrib al-shams or the setting-place of the sun*, signifies the westernmost point of his empire, because going towards the west he could not go beyond it", and that the Arabic words '*ain-in hami'at-in* literally means a "black sea." "The place referred to is no other than the Black Sea, as,

Armenia being within the Kingdom of Persia, the Black Sea formed the north-western boundary of the empire,” explains Muhammad Ali.

(Muhammad Ali has explained in detail Dhul-qarnain and the Gog and Magog, which is too voluminous to enter here. There are differences of opinion as to the identity of Dhul-qarnain. Muhammad Ali identifies Dhul -qarnain with “Darius I Hystaspes (521-485 BC).” Malik Ghulam Farid identifies him with “Cyrus.” And Yusuf Ali says, “Popular opinion identifies Zul-qarnain with Alexander the Great.”

Muhammad Ali and Malik Ghulam Farid have made extensive commentaries on Dhul-qarnain. Yusuf Ali has devoted an impressive five-page Appendix to this topic at the end of chapter 18. In this Appendix he notes: “It is one of the wonders of the Qur'an, that, spoken through an Ummi's (unschooled one's) mouth, it should contain so many incidental details which are absolutely true.” And that “Each of the episodes mentioned is historical. But the pomp and glitter of military conquest are not mentioned. On the contrary spiritual motives are revealed and commended.” Which “spiritual significance” is the “chief thing to note in the story”).

Allāh, God, does not “allow” man to “wage constant war with each other”. Allah gives man a term of life and furnishes him with guidance for righteous living. If man wants to squander his brief respite in wars and iniquities till his appointed term it is his own doing. No blame is to be laid at the feet of Allāh, God.

108. “Dost thou not see that we send devils against the infidels to incite them to sin”—(Qur'an 19:83).

What this means is that God gave the devil respite till an appointed term to lead man astray. Whereas He has shown man the two paths of life—that of goodness and evil—man makes his own choice.

110. “And we placed stable mountains on the earth, lest it should move with them.”—(Qur'an 21:31. Also 16:15; 31:10).

The Swami states: “If the author of the Quran had been acquainted with the phenomenon of the revolution of the earth, he would never have taught that the earth was immovable, because mountains were fixed in it. It could be argued that if there were no mountains, it would be shaken. Why does it quake when there is a seismic disturbance?”(LOT, p. 692).

Malik Ghulam Farid notes that: “Geology has established the fact that mountains have, to a great extent, secured the earth against earthquakes....The verse may also signify that the moun-tains are a great help to the earth in moving steadily on its axis. The Qur'an spoke of the earth as ‘moving round’ long before it was discovered that it was not stationary and moved on its axis and round the sun.”(Comm. 1885) (See Qur'an, 21:33; 36:40).

(Allāh recounting the angels announcing the birth of Jesus to Mary and the Swami's comments dealt with in item # 49).

112. “Seest thou not that all creatures both in the heavens and on the earth adore God? The sun, and the moon, and the stars, the mountains and the trees, and the beasts, and many men?”(Qur'an 22:18).

The Swami wrote: “When it is clear that inanimate objects cannot even know God, how can they then worship Him? This book cannot be of Divine origin. It seems to have been written by some ignorant man.” (LOT, p. 693).

But the Rig Veda—(I. CLXVI. 4. Vol. 1, p. 244) says of the Maruts: “**Ye who with mighty powers have stirred the regions up.....All creatures of the earth, all dwellings are afraid....**”

How can “all dwellings” being “inanimate objects cannot even know God, how can they then” be “afraid”?

How can mountains “prostrate themselves”, as the note to the above Hymn says: “**...it is related of Agastya that the Vindhyan mountains prostrated themselves before him; and yet the same Agastya is believed to be the regent of the star Canopus.**”—Griffith.

Worship of Allāh, God, means to follow His laws, either voluntarily as in the case of man who is equipped with reason to differentiate between evil and good, or involuntary, as in the case of animals and inanimate objects—animals who follow the in-stinct inherent in their creation, and inanimate objects, through the laws of conformation such as the moon and sun floating in their respective orbits and hydrogen and oxygen combining, in preset quantities, to form water.

(Allāh, God, revealing: “And remember her who presser-ved her virginity, and into whom we breathed our spirit.” And the Swami’s comment is dealt with in item # 49).

113. “Then shall ye be waked up on the day of Resurrection.” (Qur'an 23: 16).

To this the Swami writes: “Will the dead dwell in the tombs or in some other place till doom's Day? If they dwell in the tombs, even the virtuous souls will suffer pain on account of their bodily tenements being foulsmelling and decomposed. This mode of meting out justice is as bad as doing injustice. Moreover, the Mohammedan God and His followers are guilty of the sin of spreading disease.” (LOT, p. 694).

But even today man is exhumeing mass graves without spread-ing disease or becoming infected. However, as Allah God says that He will resurrect the dead. The dead can only be resurrected if it is whole and is functional. Thus, there would be no decay and disease at this Resurrection; which is unlike an exhumation. In the Hereafter man will be given new forms—(Qur'an 56:61).

Some advanced countries have high-tech crematoria. Conven-tional methods of cremation pollute the atmosphere—thus contri-butng to the greenhouse effect: producing tons of ashes and carbon dioxide (*and deplete the forest*). This is more pronounced during times of disasters, such as earthquakes (as in Gujarat), flooding, etc; when large numbers of corpses have to be disposed by burning.

Also, cremation ashes being airborne may end up in the respiratory systems of both humans and animals; as well as in their supply of drinking water. And with about 20,000 deaths a day in India.

One great advantage of burying is that the body can be exhumed in the future, for forensic evidence. This has proven beneficial.

114. Allāh, God, tells us that on the Day of Judgment our limbs also will give evidence as to our earthly actions; and that He is the light of the heavens and the earth.–(Qur'an 24:24, 35).

To which the Swami states: “The hands and feet being inanimate cannot give evidence. The second statement being opposed to Laws of Nature is false. Is God fire or electricity? The illustration given in the Quran cannot apply to God. Such illustrations can only apply to embodied objects.”(LOT, p. 694).

But even here on earth our hands and feet and (bodily fluids) are giving evidence as to our actions–fingerprints and footprints, eye-scanning, DNA. How much more advanced is Allah God's method of extracting evidence.

Allah God is the light. As Muhammad Ali explains: “*Nur (light) is that which manifests hidden things*, and Allah is called here the *light of the heavens and the earth*, because He has manifested them and brought them into existence.”

115. “And God hath created every animal of water. Some go on upon the belly.”–(Qur'an 24:45).

“What kind of philosophy is this that the creatures in the composition of whose body all elements have entered are said to have been generated from water alone. This is a foolish statement” the Swami says. (LOT, p. 694).

But Allah God did not say that every animal was created from water “alone.” It is a fact that the basis of all living things is water.

119. “O Moses! verily I am God, Mighty, the Wise: cast down thy rod. And when he saw it, that it moved, as though it had been a serpent, he retreated and fled. And God said O Moses, fear not, for my messengers are not disturbed with fear in my sight.” (Qur'an 27: 9-10).

“Now mark! God calls Himself Mighty, even a good man would not indulge in self-commendation, why should God do so? He became the Lord of the savages by tempting them with a sort of jugglery”, wrote the Swami. (LOT, p. 696).

Yet in the Rig Veda God says that He is the “Holiest of all” and is the “most Powerful Supreme Being”–(LOT, p. 1). So it is acceptable for the God of the Veda(s) to “indulge in self-commendation” but not for the God of the Qur'an.

If God can create this universe, raise animals and plants from dirt, if He can take up residence “in the womb” and “entered the soul,” as the Swami wrote–(LOT, p. 220, 227), and as the soul is reincarnated also as plants, surely God can transform a piece of stick into flesh, or He could inhabit the stick as He inhabits the “womb” and the “soul” (in the plant) and make it into a serpent.

121. “And Moses struck him with his fist and slew him: And he said, O Lord, verily I have injured my own soul, wherefore forgive me. So God forgave him; for He is ready to forgive, and Merciful.”–(Qur'an 28:15-16).

“Now mark again!” the Swami says, “Are not God and Moses the Prophet of the Mohammedans and the Christians, both unjust because the latter killed people and God forgave him his sins.” (LOT, p. 697).

But reading this verse in its entirety shows that Moses went to the aid of one of his people who was in a fight with their com-mon enemy. Moses unintentionally killed the

enemy. Allāh, God, is always open to sincere repentance. This is a demonstration of His mercy to man.

122. “We hereafter sent Noah unto his people, and he tarried among them one thousand years, save fifty years.” (Qur'an 29:14).

The Swami wrote: “If formerly people lived for 1,000 years, why do they not attain that age now? This statement is also wrong.”(LOT, p. 697)

(Noah living/dwelling 950 years among his people could have meant the time his teaching lasted till the coming of the next major prophet of Allāh, God: Abraham).

If a *Brahmachari* of the “highest kind” “enjoys the full span of life which is 400 years,” as the Swami writes, why is it incredible that Noah, a prophet of God, could live 950 years?—(LOT, p. 42).

If trees, such as the redwood, live thousands of years, man, who is instilled with the spirit of the Eternal, could have lived a thousand years. However, much as the significance is not how you worship, but who you worship; it is not how long you live but how beneficial you live. According to the Qur'an only Noah's people were drowned. There was no world deluge.

Incidentally, how many *Brahmacharis* of the “highest kind” have lived to the age of “400 years”? Surely in the near two billion years since the Veda(s) is said to have been revealed there must be quite a few such *Brahmacharis*.

124. “These are the signs of the wise book. He hath created the heavens without visible pillars to sustain them, and hath thrown on the earth mountains firmly rooted, lest it should move with you. Dost thou not see that the God causeth the night to succeed the day, and causeth the day to succeed the night? Dost thou not see that the ships run in the sea, through the favor of God, that He may show you of His signs?”—(Qur'an 31:2, 10, 29, 31).

The Swami wrote: “How funny! That a book like this should be regarded full of wisdom even though it teaches things opposed to science, such as the creation of the heavens without visible pillars to sustain them (*the centrifugal and magnetic forces are the invisible pillars that sustain them*) and the fixing of the mountains in the earth with a view to keep them immovable (*the mountains ensuring balance due to movements and thus rendering the earth “immovable” is not to be confused with the earth moving in orbit*). Even persons who are a little bit educated cannot write such nonsense or believe in such balderdash. Again, how wise is the statement that the day is entangled with the night and night with the day! Every body knows that day and night co-exist. The Quran cannot be a book of true knowledge, for this statement is absolutely foolish. (*But for Allāh causing the earth to rotate on its axis part of the earth would be in perpetual light and part in perpetual darkness*). It is not opposed to true knowledge to say that the ships run into the sea through the favour of God when in reality they are propelled by machinery and by sailors? (*But who has given man knowledge to build and sail ships?*). Would not the sign of God (a ship) sink if it was made of iron or stone? (*But ships are made of iron also!*). Verily this book cannot have been written by God or by a learned man.”(LOT, p. 699).

What these verses are saying is that it is due to Allāh, God's, power and mercy that man receives these favors.

125. "He governeth all things from heaven even to the earth, hereafter they shall return unto Him, on the day whose length shall be a thousand years, of those which ye compute. This is He who knoweth the future and the present; the Mighty, the Merciful." (*Muhammad Ali has shown this verse to be a prophecy about the rise and decline of Islam/Muslims*). And then formed him into proper shape, and breathed of His Spirit into him; Say, The angel of death, who is set over you, shall cause you to die...If we had pleased, we had certainly given to every soul its direction: but the word which hath proceeded from me must necessarily be fulfilled, when I said, verily I will fill hell with both genii and men"—(Qur'an 32: 5, 6, 9, 11, 13).

The Swami: "Now it is quite clear that the God of the Mohammedans is limited by space like man, for if He were Omnipresent, it could not be said of Him that He is stationed at a particular place for the purpose of carrying on administrative work and that he descends and ascends. He cannot but be regarded as limited by space if He sends down angels and Himself remains hung up in the sky, while His emissaries are sent about on errands. How could God know it, if His angels were bribed into perverting the facts of a case or sparing the life of a doomed person. He could find out only if He were Omni-scient and Omnipresent, but that He is not. If He had been so, where was the need of sending angels and testing people in any way? (*Why did God reveal the Vedas to four men only, why did He not reveal into the hearts of every Hindu or human being?*). Again, He cannot be said to be Omnipotent, because it takes a thousand years to arrange for the return of His emissaries (*as stated Muhammad Ali has shown this verse to be a prophecy in which after a thousand years of success Islam/Muslims will suffer a decline*). If there is an angel of death, what is there that will bring about his death? (*Allāh, God, who created him can bring about his death*). One angel cannot ask many people to repair to hell simultaneously, and if God looks at the fun after filling hell with innocent people who have been doomed to torture, He is unrighteous, unjust and merciless. A book teaching such things cannot be the work of God or of a learned man, while a being devoid of justice and mercy cannot be Divine." (LOT, p. 699).

Angels cannot 'pervert': they do only as they are commanded by Allāh, God—(Qur'an 66:6).

Since, as the Veda says, that the Hindu God needs "spies," this means, according to the Swami's reasoning, the Hindu God is not Omniscient—Him being in need of others. Neither could the Hindu God know if His "spies"/angels "were bribed into perverting the facts."

God testing people only means that He brings to light their inner selves. Much like in the human sphere where the examiner tests the student to show to him, and to manifest to society, his (the student's) ability. The examiner has no need to know the ability of the student. His knowledge is above that of the examined.

If the Hindu God can daily, on a worldwide basis, put souls into the wombs and eggs, of billions of humans, animals, reptiles, birds, insects, and trees, and each to its correct destination, surely the Muslim God can give the angel of death the power to have "many people to repair to hell simultaneously."

Allāh filling hell with men and jinn. What makes the Swami believe that these men and jinn are “innocent?” And if by going to hell they are “doomed to torture” then it is by their own heads and hearts and hands. However, hell is not a “torture” chamber. Hell is a purifier much like the “torture” of rehabilitation that an addict goes through to emerge a new/cleansed person. (See HELL).

In reincarnating the corrupt soul as pigs and cockroaches and worms, has the God of the Veda “doomed to torture” these souls?

As *karma* gives to all acts an “equal and opposite” reaction and “operates impartially and unerringly, awarding us exactly what we deserve,” it is the God of *karma* Who is “devoid” of mercy: there is no room in Him for forgiveness.

127. Qur'an 33:37 relates the story of Zaid divorcing his wife Zainab, and Zainab's subsequent marriage to the Prophet Mohammad.

To which the Swami comments: “It is also clear that Moham-mad was lascivious, for if he had not been so, he would not have taken his daughter-in-law as wife.” (LOT, p. 701).

(It is a rather weird reasoning that a “lascivious” person would marry mostly women who are old, and with many children, when there are camps of vestal nubiles at his command).

Zainab was not the daughter-in-law of Mohammad. Zaid was only the adopted son of the Prophet. That Mohammad was not the father of any man does not mean that he was not the father of “no body”. The prophet had children. All it means is that he was not of filial relationship with any of the men (*for them to call him “father” and that they should be addressed by him as “son”*). But that he was the Messenger of Allah to them.

(For a full treatment on Zaid and Zainab see [ZAINAB SCANDAL](#))

The Swami also wrote: “How cruel that the prophet was at liberty to divorce a wife whenever he chose to do so, while his wife was deprived of the right of obtaining a divorce even if he was guilty of misconduct.”(LOT, p. 701).

But not only was the Prophet never guilty of “misconduct”, and not only did the Prophet never divorced any of his wives, his wives also had the right to divorce him. This is made clear in the verse: “O Prophet, say to thy wives: If you desire this world’s life and its adornment, come, I will give you a provision and allow you to depart a goodly departing.”—(Qur'an 33:28).

Islam does not require that its women be ‘immured within the four walls of the house like prisoners.’ (See WOMEN)

128. “Neither is it fit for you to give any uneasiness to the Apostle of God nor to marry his wives, after him, for ever: for this would be a grave offence in the sight of God.And they who shall injure the true believers of either sex, without their deserving it, shall surely bear the fruit of calumny and a manifest injustice. And being accused, wherever they are found they shall be taken, and killed with a general slaughter, O Lord give them the double of our punishment, and curse them with a heavy curse” —(Qur'an 33:53, 57, 61, 68).-

The Swami comments: “Would not the Mohammadans feel aggrieved if some body ordained that they should be pinioned and killed, as, the Quran has done in the case of non-Muslims. The Prophet was very hard-hearted, for he prayed to God that non-Muslims should receive double the punishment awarded to Mohammedans.”(LOT, p. 702).

There is nowhere in the Qur'an that Allāh, God, has "ordained" that non-Muslims be "pinioned and killed." Muslims are allowed to fight only a defensive fight, and when they are not the aggressors. It cannot be said that Muslims are allowed to "injure" non-Muslims and their wives, be it physically or verbally. Allāh, God, says that Muslims enjoin good and forbid evil—(3:109); say only what is best—(29:46); the noblest are the best in deeds —(49:13); to speak justly 6:152).

The reason why Muslims were not allowed to marry the wives of the Prophet after his death—(Qur'an 33:53), is because these wives of the Prophet were regarded as the Mothers' of the Muslim brotherhood.

That Mohammad "prayed to God that non-Muslims should receive double the punishment awarded to Mohammedans." As I have underlined above, it is not Mohammad who uttered these words. As the preceding verse (*verse 67, which the Swami did not quote*) shows, they are the words of those who were lead astray, asking God to give their leaders double punishment for leading them astray. Here are the two verses:

"And they say: Our Lord,
we only obeyed our leaders and our great men,
so they led us astray from the path.
*Our Lord, give them a double chastisement
and curse them with a great curse.*"
(Qur'an 33:67-68)

If Muslims praying for the non-Muslims to receive double the punishment awarded to Muslims is "very hard-hearted," how would the Swami's praying for death to the writers of the *Bhagvat* and other *Puranas* be described: "Oh! Why did not the writers of *Bhagvat* and other *Puranas* die in their mothers' wombs or as soon as they were born? Had the people (of India) been saved from the hands of these popes, they would have been spared the pain and suffering that they are afflicted with?"—(LOT, pp. 406-407).

How can the Swami wish that they had die in their "mothers' wombs" or "as soon as they were born" when in order for them to be reborn as humans they would have had to have good karma in a past life? It would seem unGodly to wish for the death of others whom God has reincarnated as humans. Are not the "pain and suffering" afflicting the people (of India) a result of their bad karma?

Regarding the punishment for crimes, as Hinduism teaches, the Swami quotes Manu to let a "victorious sovereign reduce all dacoits, robbers and the like to submission by *conciliating* them, by *giving them presents* or by *turning them against each other*. If he fails to restrain them by those means let him do so by *inflicting heavy punishment on them*."(LOT, p. 177).

It would seem an injustice to inflict "*heavy punishment*" which would be in excess for the crime.

According to Hindu/Vedic teaching, a lying witness "should have his tongue cut-off"—(LOT, p. 194). According to Manu, for evidence given through certain reasons—such as "covetousness," "love," "fear," "hunger"— "Punishment may be inflicted, through property, the penis, the back, the tongue, hands, feet, eyes; ears, the nose, and the whole body." And for "the first offence let the offender be punished by *gentle admonition*, for the second by *harsh reproof*, for the third by a *fine*, and for the fourth by *corporal*

chastisement, such as flogging and caning, or by imprisonment or death penalty.”(LOT, pp. 196, 197).

Thus a first time murderer could receive a ‘slap on the wrist’ only. The Swami also quotes Manu as saying: “With whatever limb a man commits an offence, even that limb shall the king remove or destroy in order to set an example to others...”–(LOT, p. 197).

So the person who commits a crime with his legs, such as kicking, is dismembered; one who injures another with his head is decapitated; and the rapist is castrated. How is the woman guilty of seduction punished?

Manu also says, as the Swami quotes, “punishment inflicted on a king should be a thousand times heavier than that on an ordinary man”, and that “even the lowest official such as a constable, should be punished not less than eight times as heavily as an ordinary man would be.”(LOT, pp. 197, 198).

But it is an injustice to punish one individual more severely because of his status or wealth. The Swami himself declares that “the infliction of just punishment in exact accordance with the amount of crime is called *justice*.” (LOT, p. 207).

Allāh, God, tells us that the punishment must not exceed the degree of the crime:

“And if you take your turn,
then punish with the like of that with which
you were afflicted. But if you show
patience, it is certainly best for the patient.”
(Qur'an 16:126)

Hinduism teaches also, as the Swami quotes “Manu VII, 371, 372, 406, 419, 420” as saying: “Should a wife out of her family pride desert her husband and misconduct herself, let the king condemn her to be devoured by dogs before all men and women. Similarly should a husband forsake his wife and misconduct himself with other women, let the king cause that sinner to be burnt alive publicly on a red hot iron-bed”–(LOT, p. 199).

(According to Hinduism: “A woman who has been unchaste should worship Siva in his calm aspect, Siva who is Kama. Then she should summon a Brahmin and give herself to him, thinking, ‘This is Kama who has come for the sake of sexual pleasure.’ And whatever the Brahmin wishes, the sensuous woman should do. For thirteen months she should honour in this way any Brahmin who comes to the house for the sake of sexual pleasures, and there is no immorality in this for noble ladies or prostitutes.” “The Brahmin guest represents Śiva/Kāma, who purifies the woman whom he seduces, for extreme sexual licence may remove sexual stigma, just as extreme *tapas* (austerity) does.” (Cited in Wendy Doniger O’Flaherty, *Siva The Erotic Ascetic*, p. 256).

Manu also says, as the Swami quotes: “Let women be witnesses for women, the *twice-born* for the *twice-born*: *Shudras* for *Shudras*, and outcasts for outcasts.”(LOT, p. 193).

So if a crime has been committed against these and there is none of their *Class* present, no one can give witness on their behalf. If these commit a crime and there is none of their *Class* present, no evidence against them will be accepted.

132. “A cup shall be carried round unto them, filled from a unruffled fountain, for the delight of those who drink; And near them shall lie the virgins of paradise.....”–(Qur'an

43:71. *The Swami has conjoined several verses on the rewards of Paradise from chapter 43 –verses 44, 45, 48, 57, 131, 132, 133, 134, which I have been unable to reconcile. Except for verse 44 which equates to Muhammad Ali's verse 71, the others may be a misquote of the chapter).*

The Swami: “Well! The Mohammedans cry that it is a sin to drink wine on this earth but in their paradise streams of wine flow. It is good that Mohammedans have rendered some service to the cause of temperance here, but they have been more than compensated for this abstinence in paradise. So many women have been allotted to each man there, he would find it difficult to fix his affections on one. (*Does this mean that a man with one woman doesn't have difficulty fixing his affections on this one wife? There shouldn't be any adulterer then. You would think that a man with “many women” allotted to him would be too occupied to fix his attention on other women*). The place must be afflicted with maladies. If the dwellers have got bodies, they must die and if they have got no bodies, they cannot gratify their lust. What then is the use of a paradise?”(LOT, p. 704)

Will the wine in heaven be the same as that on earth? It is not within reason that Allah God Who has kept man away from drunkenness on earth would allow such a habit on the spiritual plain. We have ‘alcohol free’ beer, ‘alcohol free’ wine, ‘alcohol free’ champagne. What ‘alcohol free’ will man come up with next? If man can have ‘alcohol free’ wine on earth, consider how much purer the “wine” in Paradise would be.

The Swami also questions: “Where did these women (of Paradise) come from? Are they dwellers of paradise or have they been imported? If they have been imported, they will surely go back and if they permanently dwell there, what were they doing before the day of resurrection?”(LOT, p. 705).

These women are perhaps doing the same thing(s) the *yogis* and the *sanyasis* who have escaped the cycle of deaths and rebirths are doing on the heavenly planets and in Krsnaloka, till the “Grand Dissolution (of the universe)”.

And, speaking of the *horse sacrifice*, the Rig Veda says:

“No, here thou diest not, thou art not injured:
by easy paths unto the Gods thou goest.
Both Bays, both spotted mares are now thy fellows,
and to the ass’s pole is yoked the Charger.”

(I. CLXII. 21. Vol. 1, p. 229)

And this verse is explained as: “*Both Bays*: thou art now associated in heaven with the two bay horses of Indra, the two spotted mares of the Maruts, and the ass that draws the chariot of the Asvins.”—Griffith.

If horses can live in “heaven” forever, and if they can be sent to live in heaven, surely women can be in paradise forever.

It is interesting to note how the Swami has perceived carnality in these youths and women serving in Paradise. Wonder if the Swami, and the Hindus who share his vision, also sees carnality in the handsome youths and alluring women servers at fancy restaurants in the human sphere of life? Are these servers here to offer carnal gratification to the diners?

If the Muslim Paradise is also about sensuality, isn’t sexual relationship, even on earth, within the circle of Divine pre-scription blissful? Where then is the harm if there should

be intimate contact between husband and wife in Paradise? And if the dwellers of Paradise would have multiple spouses where is the harm, considering that Hinduism allows polygamous and polyandrous relations? The famous five Pandava brothers had a common wife, Draupadi.

However, as pointed out, not only will we be given new forms in the Hereafter, the Qur'anic descriptions of Paradise are figu-rative. As Allāh, God, tells in Qur'an 32:17, "And no soul knows what delights of the eyes is kept hidden for them, as a reward for their (good) deeds." And as the Prophet Mohammad explained:

Allah says, I have prepared for
My righteous servants that which
no eye has seen and no ear
has heard, and which the heart of
man cannot conceive.

(Bokhari Vol. 4, # 467; Vol. 6, #:302-303; Vol. 9 # 589).

The Swami states, "Perpetual happiness cannot reign where women are to be found." (LOT, p. 705) (*Perhaps women can say the same of men*).

But, (*while there are, no doubt, wayward women as well as men*), Allāh, God, says that men and women were created from the same essence—(Qur'an 4:1); that they are garments to the other—(2:187); that He created her to be his mate, that he might find peace and comfort in her, and He has put between them love and compassion —(7:189; 30:21); that He has established marriages between men and women—(Qur'an 25:54; 16:72; 24:32); that women are to be honored—(4:1); and that women and men are protectors of one another—(9:71).

In Islam, Women are not objects of revulsion. And what is the Hindu heaven like? (*Details further on*).

137. "His, the keys of the Heavens and of the Earth! He giveth with open hand or sparingly, to whom He will. He createth what He will, and He giveth daughters to whom He will, and sons to whom He will. Or He giveth them children of both sexes, and He maketh whom He will childless. It is not for man that God should speak with him, but by vision, or from behind a veil, or He sendeth a messenger to reveal what He will." (Qur'an 42:12; 49-51).

The Swami states: "God must be possessed of an inexhaustible stock of keys considering that he must unlock each and all places. Again it argues childishness on His part to bless with plenty and super-abundance whomsoever He pleases regardless of his merits, or to take away the same from any without weighing his demerits.Mark the extraordinary cleverness of the author of the Quran! It is expressly designed to captivate and entrap the females also. If the Mohammadan God can create whatever He pleases, can He then create another God? If He cannot, are we to understand that His Omnipotence here has come to a dead halt? And if it is God that grants offspring unto men, who is it that grants the same unto fowls, fishes, pigs, etc., that have a more numerous progeny? And why cannot He grant offspring (to mortals) unless men and women cohabit? Why does He condemn some women to a life of sterility and thereby afflict them? (*This could also be asked of the Vedic God*).Should you argue that God is All-knowing and All-pervading (as He really is), this assertion about Him talking from behind a curtain and obtaining news as if it were by post would be utterly meaningless.

If He stands in need of such agencies, He could not be God. He must be rather some shrewd piece of humanity. Hence the Quran can never be of Divine origin." (LOT, pp. 708-709).

Allāh, God, does not "take away" from any: He only withholds (from giving more). A king can give to whomsoever he likes, regardless of their needs, without him being guilty of any partiality, seeing that the treasure is his to do with as he pleases. Allāh, God, having the "the keys of the heavens and of the Earth," means that Allah has knowledge and control of all things.

Allāh, God, creating what He pleases—(Qur'an 42:49-50) is self explanatory: (as the verses say) He gives daughters or sons to whom He will, or He gives both daughters and sons to some and leaving some barren. Muhammad Ali explained: "The birth of a daughter was looked upon by the Arabs as a calamity (see Qur'an 16:58, 59), this being due to the low position which women (is) held in society. The wonderful change brought about by Islam in the status of women is clearly fore-shadowed in this early revelation, where the daughter has precedence over the son." It is a mystery that the Qur'an "is expressly designed to captivate and entrap females also."

If God was to give women children without the need to "cohabit," there would be no family unit; there would be no need for God to put love and compassion and desire between man woman (*the lacking of which may result in indifference between them*); mothers would have to care for and maintain children on her own (*which may be a severe hardship, especially during her pre and post-natal periods*).

(Whether God can "create another God" has been dealt with above).

Allah God "talking from behind a curtain and obtaining news as if it were by post;" the Hindu God not only has enemies (*as noted in item # 21*), He has His own His spies: "Varuna,His spies are seated round about. The God whom enemies threaten not....". (I. XXV. 13-14. Vol. 1, p. 35).

Since the Hindu God "stands in need of such agencies (spies), He could not be God, He must be rather some shrewd piece of humanity," as the Swami says, hence the Veda "can never be of Divine origin."

138. "And when Jesus came with manifest proofs." (Qur'an 43:63).

The Swami: "If Jesus too was sent by God, why did He then send down the Quran whose teaching is opposed to that of Christ? Again, since the Biblical teaching is opposed to that of the Quran, neither of these is a Divine revelation." (LOT, p. 709).

(*Allah God's reason for sending prophets to all nations has already been dealt with*). The Biblical teachings, as revealed to Moses and Jesus, are not opposed to the Qur'anic teaching. Moses did not teach that the Jews were God's chosen people "to the exclusion of other people;" and Jesus did not teach Trinity, Divine sonship (as begetting—fatherhood—requires the joining of sperm and ovum), inherited sin, and vicarious atonement. (*This has already been dealt with*).

In his writing the Swami says that the Bhagavad Gita is "opposed to the *Veda*"—(LOT, p. 219). If the Biblical teaching "being opposed" to that of the Qur'an disqualifies them as being Divine revelation, then by the Swami's own reasoning, the Gita being "opposed" to the *Veda*, "neither of these (*the Veda and Gita*) is a Divine revelation."

140. “A **picture** of the paradise which is promised to the God-fearing! Therein are rivers of water, which corrupt not, rivers of milk whose taste changeth not: and rivers of wine, delicious to those who quaff it.”—(Qur'an 47:15).

The Swami comments: “Can (the Mohammedan) paradise, in which rivers of pure water, milk and clarified honey flow, be any better than this mortal world. Rivers of milk, whose taste changeth not, cannot exist, because it turns sour in a short time. The enlightened people do not believe in the Mohammadan faith since it inculcates such incredible and inhuman teachings.” (LOT, p. 710).

The Swami, as usual, has given this verse a literal interpretation. Whereas from the very beginning the verse tells us, as I have emphasized, that this is a “picture” (a parable) of Paradise. As stated, the rewards of Paradise are presented in figurative expressions.

However, clearly, if God can churn the ocean and bring nectar out of it and separates it from poison and bring forth a horse and elephant from the nectar as the *Bhagavad-Gita* says—(10:27 and explained by Swami Prabhupada), then, for sure, God can keep the rivers of milk of Paradise from turning “sour.”

143. The Swami Quotes Qur'an 66:1, 5: “”Why O Prophet dost thou hold that to be forbidden, which God hath made lawful to thee, from a desire to please thy wives, since God is lenient, and merciful. Verily God is His protector. Happily if he put you both away, his Lord in exchange will give him wives better than you, Muslims, believers, devoutly penitent, observant of fasting, both known of men and virgins.”

And he comments: “If we reflect a little on the above, we shall see that God is but a servant of Mohammad to manage his affairs –internal as well as external! (*And don't all devotees of God pray to Him to mange their affairs –internal as well as external?*)

Don't Hindus pray to the God of the Veda (as noted in item # 76) to manage their affairs—“internal as well as external”—to show them “where thousand spoils are gained,” to “win spoil of cattle” to “Drive thou away our enemies,” to “make riches easy to be won,” to “Send riches hither with thy stream in thousands, both of steeds and kine, Send spoil of war and high renown”?

Aren't Hindus praying to the God of the Veda to “free us from all pain and grief, and always guide us to the path of rectitude which leads to true happiness” and to not “destroy our young ones, nor our old ones, foetuses, mothers, and fathers, nor those who are dear to us, nor our relations, nor our bodies”: aren't they praying to God for Him to manage their affairs—“internal as well as external”? (LOT, pp. 2, 213).

And didn't the Swami himself prayed to God to manage the affairs of his sect: “May God through his mercy rid us, Aryas, of this dreadful disease;” and lamented that if Hindus had wor-shipped God instead of stones “they would have put the barbarians, to rout and gained a victory over them”?—(LOT, pp. 321, 391).

Why did the Hindu God gave instructions to man if not to “manage his affairs”?

The Swami notes two stories connected with 65:1 about why the Prophet Mohammad had forbidden himself:- his abstinence from honey and; “The second story is that one night Mohammad was to go to a particular wife of his. She was not there—in fact she was gone to her father's house; Mohammad, therefore, sanctified a female slave of his! When the wife referred to hear of this, she became angry with the Prophet and made

him swear that he would never do such a thing again.” Which incident led to the revelation of the verse under discussion (65:1).

And the Swami comments: “Let the wise declare if ever God acts as an arbitrator in the household affairs of any man. (*Didn't God, Krishna, act as an arbitrator between the Pandavas and the Duryodhanas in the Bhagavad-Gita?*) And as regards Mohammad's character, sufficient light is thrown on it by the afore-mentioned stories, for how can a man, who is the husband of many wives, be either a pious man or a prophet? (*How many wives did Krishna have; he even dallied with Radha, the wife of another, and he is revered as God. And Hinduism allows not only polygamy and polyandry but also Niyoga* –contract marri-ages–in which a childless widow/widower can have temporary marriages with up to twelve spouses, one after the other, for raising children; and in a marriage where the husband is sterile or the wife suffers from a chronic disease; and also “If a man be not able to control his passions while his wife and she is pregnant, he may contract *Niyoga* with (a widow) and beget offspring on her.” LOT pp. 133-138, 140. For more on *Niyoga* see HINDUISM). Again, is he not partial, and therefore, sinful who, actuated by partiality, disgraces one wife and honours another. (*Mohammad never disgraced any of his wives*). And how can he, who, not being content with many wives, co-habits with his slaves, be moral, God-fearing and pious?” (LOT, pp. 712-713).

This alleged “female slave” that the Swami claims Mohammad “sanctified” was Mary, the Coptic, a maid given to the Prophet by the Leader of Egypt. And how did Mohammad “sanctify” Mary?

Allāh expressly forbids fornication and adultery. *Mary was a wife of the Prophet, not a concubine or a “sanctified” slave.* In Islam any and all carnal relations outside of marriage is forbidden.

The verses of the Qur'an which relates to this alleged “sexual scandal” are 66:1-5:

“O Prophet, why dost thou forbid (thyself) that which Allah has made lawful for thee? Seekest thou to please thy wives?” (1)

“Allah indeed has sanctioned for you the expiation of your oaths” (2)

“And when the Prophet confided an information to one of his wives –but when she informed (others) of it, and Allah informed him of it, he made known part of it and passed over part.” (3)

“If you both ('Aisha and Hafsa) turn to Allah... and if you back up one another against him, then surely Allah is his Patron” (4)

“Maybe, his Lord, if he divorce you will give him in your place wives better than you, submissive, faithful, obedient, penitent, adorers, fasters, widows, and virgins” (5)

Mary was a wife of Mohammad. It is hardly credible that Mohammad would have intimate relations with Mary out of wedlock—which would be adultery. Islam (as well as

the Torah) forbids this and the penalty for this is a hundred lashes, (and Mary, a Christian, would have been subjected to stoning to death). As Muhammad Ali says, “It is a fact that the Prophet never kept a slave”–(Comm. 2517).

If Mary was Mohammad’s “sanctified” wife why then should Hafsa make such a stink if Mohammad was with Mary when Hafsa was not home (*even if it was Hafsa’s turn to be with him*)? How could this relation be of such bitterness to Hafsa for her to tell ‘Aisha, and for Mohammad to be “ostracized” for it? How could ‘Aisha “expose” Mohammad if he was with his “sanctified” wife? Further, Mary, as a wife of the Prophet, is ranked equally with the other wives of the Prophet. Why then should the Prophet’s intimate relations with her be viewed with an evil eye?

66:3 above speaks of “an information” the Prophet had given to one of his wives. Hafsa surprising Mohammad in bed with Mary could not be “an information” the Prophet gave to one of his wives. 66:4 speaks of the wives ‘backing up one another;’ Hafsa surprising Mohammad and Mary could not be something that the wives were ‘backing up one another’ in. How could ‘Aisha back up Hafsa in a matter when she (‘Aisha) was not present at the time of the Prophet and Mary were in bed? ‘Aisha would have been found to be a liar. What is it then that the wives were ‘backing up one another’ in against the Prophet?

The verses quoted above (66:1-5) has nothing to do with Mary the Coptic. Verses one and three are dealing with two separate matters as careful reading of these verses and as the reports of the Tradition show. Verse one recounts the Prophet’s taking oath to keep away from his wives on account of their demands for material wants, which is in reference to Qur'an 33:28 which says: “O Prophet say to thy wives, if you desire this world’s life and its adornments...” This verse clearly is in answer to the demands of the wives of the Prophet for worldly glamour. And “The Holy Prophet,” as Malik Ghulam Farid points out “had severely taken to heart his wives’ demand for amenities of life, and in order to show his extreme displeasure had sworn to keep away from them for one month”–(comm. 3072).

Regarding the revelation of this verse (66:1) in which the Prophet took an oath to separate from his wives, Bokhari notes a long narration in which ‘Umar says that ‘Aisha and Hafsa were the ones who backed up one another against the Prophet. And that his wife told him that his daughter, Hafsa, argues with the Prophet till he becomes displeased. Whereupon ‘Umar went to Hafsa who admitted, “we argue with him.” To which her father advised her “Don’t be betrayed by the one who is proud of her beauty because of the love of Allah’s Apostle (peace be on him) for her (i.e. ‘Aisha).” Soon afterwards the Prophet separated himself temporarily from all his wives. (Bokhari, Vol. 6, # 435).

Verse 3 (of ch. 66) which says, “And when the Prophet con-fided an information to one of his wives –but when she informed (others) of it, and Allah informed him of it, he made known part of it and passed over part,” recounts the intrigue of ‘Aisha and Hafsa to tell the Prophet, who used to drink honey at the house of Zainab, his wife, that he smelled of maghafir, “a kind of bad-smelling resin.” To which the Prophet promised “I shall never take it (honey) again. I have taken an oath as to that, and you should not tell anybody about it”–(Bokhari Vol. 6, # 434).

(It is to be noted, whereas this plot to tell the Prophet that he smelled of maghafir was hatched by ‘Aisha and Hafsa, the Prophet confided **only to** ‘Aisha about this “oath” not to take honey anymore, the words “you should not tell **anybody** about it” confirms this. How-ever, it is obvious that ‘Aisha passed on this information of the success of their scheme to Hafsa. And this is what is referred to in verse 3 (of ch. 66) which says: “And when the Prophet confided an information to one of his wives –but when she informed [others] of it”).

In summary, 66:1 and 66:3 recounts, respectively, the Prophet taking oath to separate himself from his wives on account of their demand for worldly comforts, and the intrigue of ‘Aisha and Hafsa in the *maghafir* affair. Being wives of the Prophet these women were to live simple and modest lives so as to serve as a model for the community. Verses 4 and 5 offer them the high road of repentance, or replacement. As Muhammad Ali says:

“The story therefore that Hafsah’s discovery of the Prophet having conjugal relations with her (Mary) upset the Prophet to such a degree that he swore not to have anything more to do with her is a pure invention, and the known facts not only nullify the calumny, but brand it as another of those fables invented by Christian writers who seek to vilify Islam”–(Qur’anic comm. 2517).

It is doubtful that a man who was himself publicly sunk in sexual degradation could lead others to sexual purity. It is not presumptuous to say that the three most notable passions of men are power, wealth, and glamorous women; (*and in the case of women, comfort and pleasure*). The wives of the Prophet are here told–(66:4) that if they consider themselves as women of sophistication and above a life of simplicity and strictures, which as wives of the Prophet they are to observe, then Allah will replace them with wives who are devout from both categories of women–matrons and virgins. As the Qur’an is a guidance for Muslims to be modest and moderate, Allah has related this verse to be a red flag to Muslims of all times, who may be tempted to put desire before duty.

(Regarding the Qur’an 33:50-51, where the Prophet is allowed multiple wives, ‘Aisha, as already noted, may have remarked to the Prophet that “your Lord hastens in fulfilling your wishes and desires” (which some may want to interpret to mean that ‘Aisha was doubtful of the Prophet’s truthfulness, when in fact it could merely have been an observation on her part)–(Bokhari Vol. 6, # 311). But ‘Aisha also eloquently said about the Prophet that “Whoever tell you that he concealed (some of Allah’s orders), is a liar”–(Bokhari Vol. 6. # 378). Not-ably, Allah ‘hastened’ to the aid of ‘Aisha also, when she was slandered–Qur’an 24:11-20; Bokhari Vol. 6 # 274).

145. “And the heavens shall be rent asunder, for on that day it will be fragile”. “And the angels shall be on its sides, and over them on that day eight shall bear up the throne of thy Lord.” “And he who shall bear his book given to him in his right hand shall say to friends, Take ye it, read ye my book.” But he who shall have his book given to him in his left hand will say, “O, that the book had never been given!”–(Qur’an 69:16, 17, 19, 25).

“Can the heaven ever be divided?” the Swami questions. “If you call the sky above *heaven*, it is against the dictum of science. There is no doubt now as to the God of the

Qoran being corporeal, since none who has not a body can sit on a throne and order it to be borne by eight men on their shoulders.To place books (of their deeds) in the right hand of the virtuous and have it read out and then send them to heaven, while to place books (of their deeds) in the left hand of the wicked and send them to hell, and to dispense justice with the help of books are very strange doings for an Omniscient God! Can an All-knowing Being ever act like this? It is mere childish prattle!" states the Swami. (LOT p. 714).

The heavens and earth are not everlasting. People given books in right/left hand does not mean that Allāh, God, is not Omni-scient. Allāh, God, is Omniscient. Man is not. Man needs record as evidence of his past (actions).

About eight bearing the throne of Allāh, God: This is an allegorical expression.

Muhammad Ali has noted that the word "eight is not followed by any word showing who or what these eight are;" "the one thing that should be borne in mind in interpreting such allegorical words is that the Divine Being Himself is *al-Qayyum*, or the *Self-Subsisting by Whom all things subsist* (2:255). This being taken as the basis, it is clear that other things are not a support for the Divine Being, but all created things, whether angels or any beings above angels, subsist by God.....Now there are four attributes of the Divine Being which are specially connected with the maintenance of the world. The opening chapter of the Holy Qur'an is, as shown in the preliminary note to that chapter, the essence of the whole of the Qur'an, and that chapter speaks of four attributes of the Divine Being in connection with the maintenance of *al-'alamin*, i.e., *the whole of the creation*. These attributes are mentioned in the names *Rabb*, *Rahman*, *Raheem*, and *Malik*, and a reference to the notes on these four words in the opening chapter will show that these four attributes, *providence*, *beneficence*, *mercy* and *requital*, are really the chief attributes which bring the creation to perfection and from which all other attributes may be inferred. These four are thus the Personal attributes of the Divine Being which precede all, encompass all, make all to attain to their goal of perfection and remain after all. Hence these are the four *hamalat al-'arsh*, or *the bearers of the Throne of Power*, so far as this world is concerned.

Why are they eight on the day of Resurrection? The other world is a complete, but at the same time a new, manifestation of the spiritual realities of this life. Hence, there is a new manifestation of the four attributes of the Divine Being by which the world subsists, and thus these four attributes become eight on the day of Resurrection. To clear up any misunderstanding I may add that, as Divine attributes are brought into action through the agency of angels, the four or eight attributes that are considered the bearers of the Throne of Power would also be manifested through angels, and in this sense we may look upon the bearers of the 'Arsh as being four or eight angels."-(Qur'anic comm. 2555).

147. "For He it is who formed you by successive steps. See ye not how God has created the seven heavens one over the other. And He has placed therein the moon as a light, and has placed there the sun as a torch."-(Qur'an 71:14-16).

To which the Swami argues: "If God created the soul, it can never be eternal or immortal. How can it then live for ever in paradise when what is created must perish? How can God place one heaven over another, since it is formless and all-pervading. If you give the name heaven to some thing other than *Akash* (ether), it would serve no useful purpose. If heavens are placed one over the other, the sun and the moon cannot be placed between them. If they are placed in their middle, then only those that are immediately above and below will be in light; all others, beginning from the second heaven will be in darkness. But such is not the case, hence all this is wrong."(LOT, p. 715).

Whereas the life span of ordinary humans is about seventy years, the perfect *Brahmachari*'s life span is "400 years," as the Swami says. Allah God being the Creator and Vanquisher of the soul, He can give it existence for as long as He pleases.

The heavens and earth are not shielded from the other, like rooms in a building where walls may interfere with light reaching the other. The light of the sun is not blocked by one orb to the other. The sun is ninety-three million miles from the earth. The light of the sun, because of open space, is projected onto the moon as well. However: Whereas Allāh, God, says in Qur'an 71:15 that He "created the seven heavens one over the other", in Qur'an 65:12 He tells us that He "created seven heavens, and of the earth the like thereof" (*meaning seven earths as well*). Muhammad Ali has commented:

"The statement made here that there are "seven heavens and of the earth the like thereof" throws light upon what is meant by heavens where the number seven is mentioned. The seven heavens are elsewhere called the *seven ways* (Qur'an 23:17) and the seven earths may therefore be the seven major planets of the solar system, the earth itself being the eighth, their orbits being spoken of as the seven heavens or seven ways. It should, however, be borne in mind that the heavens are often referred to without a limitation of number, and include the whole of the starry creation. Another point worth noting is that the mention of seven heavens does not preclude the existence of more. For the application of the word *seven* and for further discussion, see note # 46"—(Qur'anic comm. 2516). (Part of note # 46 says, al-Raghib "makes the meaning very clear when he says: "Every *sama*, i.e. *heaven*, is a heaven in relation to what is beneath it and an earth in relation to what is above it."").

(Muhammad Ali's translation of the Qur'an with text, commentary and notes, as well as other books, can be viewed online: www.muslim.org).

149. "And the sun and the moon shall be together." (Qur'an 75:8). The Swami questions: "Can the sun and the moon ever join together? Mark! What senseless talk is this! What purpose is served by joining the sun and the moon, and why should not all the worlds be joined together? Can these impossible statements have ever proceeded from God? Surely they cannot be the inventions of any but the unenlightened." (LOT, p. 716).

This verse is a prophecy about the Doomsday. Bashir-Ud-Din Mahmood states:

"The phenomena of Moon joining the Sun was predicted by the Holy Qur'an in its verses 75(8-9), many centuries earlier than the scientific speculations of to-day," he wrote,

“tidal forces keep the moon drifting away from the Earth. Its orbit is now becoming wider at the rate of about 3 cm a year. Eventually the Earth will not be able to hold the Moon, and then it will fall in the Sun.” “Thus science considers the Doomsday of the Earth as an accepted reality, though there are questions about the ways in which it will take place.” And, “As scientific knowledge builds up with rapid advancement in various fields, the extent of the wealth of knowledge contained in the Qur'an is dawning upon us.” (*Doomsday and Life after Death*, pp. 133, 134, 113; 19).

152. *“When the sun shall be folded up. And when the stars shall fall. And when the mountains shall be set in motion. And when the Heaven shall be stripped away.”*—(*Qur'an 81:1-3, 11*). “It is extremely foolish to say that the sun, which is a sphere, will be folded up. Now how will the stars fall, and how will the mountains, which are lifeless, be set in motion? Again, is the sky a beast that it will be stripped away? Only the most ignorant people such as savages can talk like this,” states the Swami. (LOT, p. 717).

These are prophetic statements about the Doomsday. The folding up of the sun refers to the sun burning it self out—ending up as a “black dwarf star.” *The stars falling/become dust-colored/ shall disperse:* as the sun collapses, the stars “will go out one by one.” *The mountains passing away and heaven being stripped:* in its final “phase” of burning itself out, “the sun’s central temperature will have risen steadily towards a billion degrees,” wrote Paul Davies. Thus under this tremendous heat of “a billion degrees” the heavens will likely appear as liquid metal –molten copper or red hide, as the Qur'an says. As the sun burns itself out, it “will appear to fill half the sky. At that time, the oceans will boil and any life left here will perish,” wrote James Trefil. And, as the sun burns itself out it “may have become so dis-tended that the inner planets will have been engulfed, the Earth’s atmosphere stripped away and the solid rocks melted or even vaporized,” wrote Paul Davies. See the following:

Events of the Doomsday in the Qur'an:

1. *Sun will fold up:* (*Qur'an 81:1*). As the sun burns itself out it “will swell up, turning into the sort of star that astronomers call a red giant”; and will end up as a “black dwarf star.” (Paul Davies, *God and the New Physics*, pp. 200, 201).

2. *Stars will fall, become dust-colored (lose light):* (*Qur'an 81:2*). As the sun collapses “The stars in the sky will go out one by one.” “Almost all the stars we now see would either be so dim as to be invisible or appear as faint points in a sea of blackness.” (James Trefil, *The Dark Side of the Universe*, p. 190).

3. *The heaven will look like molten copper; red hide:* (*Qur'an 70:6-8; 55:37*, respectively). In its final “phase” of burning itself out, “the sun’s central temperature will have risen steadily towards a billion degrees.” (Paul Davies, *God and the New Physics*, p. 201).

Thus under this tremendous heat of “a billion degrees” the heavens will likely appear as liquid metal –molten copper or red hide, as the Qur'an says.

4. **Ocean will boil:** (Qur'an 81:6; 82:3) As the sun burns itself out, it "will appear to fill half the sky. At that time, the oceans will boil and any life left here will perish," wrote James Trefil in his book *The Dark Side of the Universe*, (p. 190).

And, as the sun burns itself out it "may have become so distended that the inner planets will have been engulfed, the Earth's atmosphere stripped away and the solid rocks melted or even vaporized," wrote Paul Davies. (*God and the New Physics*, p. 200).

5. **Sun and Moon will join together:** (Qur'an 75:8-9). "The phenomena of Moon joining the Sun was predicted by the Holy Qur'an in its verses 75(8-9), many centuries earlier than the scientific speculations of today," wrote Bashir-Ud-Din Mahmood, "*tidal forces keep the moon drifting away from the Earth. Its orbit is now becoming wider at the rate of about 3 cm a year. Eventually the Earth will not be able to hold the Moon, and then it will fall in the Sun.*"

"Thus science considers the Doomsday of the Earth as an accepted reality, though there are questions about the ways in which it will take place." And, "As scientific knowledge builds up with rapid advancement in various fields, the extent of the wealth of knowledge contained in the Qur'an is dawning upon us." (*Doomsday and Life after Death*, pp. 133, 134, 113; 19).

159. "Verily, we have caused it to descend on the night of power. And who shall teach thee what the night of power is? Therein descend the angels and the ***spirit*** by permission of their Lord for every matter."—(Qur'an 97:1-2, 4).

The Swami questions, "If the whole of the Quran was revealed in one night, how can the assertion that a particular verse was revealed at a particular time be true?We have already said that there is no *up* and *down* in space, but it is said that the angels and the Holy Ghost, at the command of God, come here to manage the affairs of this world....So far the Quran has talked about God, the angels and the prophet, now we have got the mention of a fourth being, named, the Holy Ghost. One does not know what is meant by the Holy Ghost. The fourth is an addition to the three personages believed in by the Christians, namely, God, the Son and the Holy Ghost."(LOT, p. 719).

Whereas there is no up and down in space. From an earthly perspective, just as there is a rising and setting of the sun, there is up and down as a standard of reference. As God is regarded as the Highest, He is revered as being above us or up. And when a devotee make supplication he either looks skyward (up) or bows his head (down), in acknowledgment to his lowly status in relation to God's.

It is doubtful that one who has read the Qur'an would entertain that the whole of it was revealed in one night. The revelation of the Qur'an began in the month of Ramadan, and continued for about twenty-three years. The "month of Ramadan is particularly spoken of as being the month in which the Holy Qur'an was revealed," explains Muhammad Ali. He also says, "the word "Qur'an" is applicable as well to a portion as to the whole" of the Book. (Qur'anic comm. 227; 2777).

There is no mention of a "Holy Ghost" in the above Qur'anic verse: the mention is "Spirit"—the angels and the *spirit*, as emphasized. This "Spirit" is the Angel Gabriel, who is mentioned separately from angels—(Qur'an 2:98); and who is also referred to as

Holy Spirit—(16:102); and also as *Faithful Spirit*—(Qur'an 26:193). There is no “Holy Ghost” in Islam.

As noted at the beginning of this topic, the Swami has used verses of the Qur'an out of context, without, seemingly, any knowledge as to background to which verses were revealed, and has given a literal interpretation to these verses whereas verses of the Qur'an are of both literal and allegorical meanings. The above material is sufficient, not only to refute the Swami's claim against the Qur'an, but to dispel the claim that the Vedic religion is the religion for “enlightened” mankind.

The materials in the Qur'an—Prophecies and Scientific ideas—are sufficient evidence to establish the Qur'an as the Word of Allah God; Islam as the only religion from God; and Mohammad as the Messenger of Allāh, God.

*

The Hindu heaven: What is the Hindu heaven like? Can the soul enjoy everlasting happiness? The Swami wrote: “when the powers of the soul, its instruments (such as body and bodily organs), and its means are all *finite*, how could the reward extend over an infinite period? *Secondly*, the soul does **not possess infinite capacity**, infinite means and infinite activity to enjoy *infinite* bliss, how could it then enjoy *Everlasting happiness*?” (LOT, p. 286). Yet the Swami states: “The soul **was never created**. It is beginningless like God” and that “God reside within the soul.” (LOT, p. 221, 226).

As the soul is “beginningless like God,” is “infinite” and as “God reside(s) within the soul,” then the soul *does* have the “infinite capacity” to enjoy “*Everlasting happiness*”—it being beginningless and having God within.

But the Hindu souls do not have to go to heaven to meet God; seeing that God is “all-Pervading,” is “present in the womb,” “reside(s) within the soul” and have “entered the soul” as the Swami wrote.—(LOT, pp. 220, 226, 27).

(According to Hinduism one Divine day is 4, 320, 000,000 years; and the period of the Grand Dissolution of the universe, which is known as the “duration of Emancipation” of the soul, is said to be “3,11,040,000,000,000 years”—(LOT, pp. 141, 285, respectively). Swami Dayananda quotes the Mundak Upanishad, III, 2, 6, as saying that the soul, after enjoying its emancipation “is again born into this world”—(p. 285). And, as noted, the length of the soul's “duration of Emancipation” is “3,11,040, 000,000,000 years.”

And what manner of bliss does this emancipated soul enjoy? The Swami wrote:

“The *emancipated* soul roams about in the Infinite All-pervading God as it desires, sees all nature through pure knowledge, meets other *emancipated* souls, sees all the laws of nature in operation, goes about in all the worlds visible and invisible, sees all objects that it comes across, the more its knowledge increases the happier it feels. Being altogether pure, the soul acquires perfect knowledge of all hidden things in the state of Emancipa-tion. This extreme bliss alone is called Heaven (*swar-ga*).”(LOT p.301).

Imagine this soul –this “one ten thousandth part of the upper portion of the hair point in size,” as Swami Prabhupada says– ‘roaming’ the vast galaxies for some 3.11 trillion years, and meeting other souls.

So, this eternal soul, being of the same “essence” as God, after spending perhaps one billion years (about quarter the Divine day) dwelling in and feeding on filth, and other lowly conditions –this soul now “roams about” freely in heaven for more than 3.11 trillion years, where it “acquires perfect knowledge of all hidden things” (only to forget it afterwards), and eventually returns to earth to spend another 4. 32 billion years, perhaps some as sub-humans, to again ‘roam’ in heaven for another 3.11 trillion years, receiving the same knowledge, and forgetting. Repeating this cycle again and again and... *Ad infinitum. Is this heaven?*

The Muslim Paradise consists of splendidorous Gardens with rivers flowing beneath, and of garments of silk, and beautiful luxuriant couches, and goblets of silver and gold, and its servers with big beautiful lustrous eyes and its youths like scattered pearls in fine green silk and thick brocade and bracelets of silver, and its fruits of all kinds, and fountains of abundance, and of drinks flavored with camphor and ginger, and absolute peace of mind–let me dwell for ever in this “infinite misery,” as the Swami so starkly portrays it.

If man should live to be a million years it is doubtful that he would tire of a life of affluence and would deem it “infinite misery”; when in fact his rat race in this world is, without doubt, driven by his desire for a life of ease and luxury.

(A survey should be carried out to determine how many individuals would prefer the Hindu heaven –roaming the heavens for 3.11 trillion years, gathering knowledge, and forgetting it—and to return to earth, possibly as sub-humans, for some four billion years; and how many Hindus, affluent and destitute, would prefer a life in the Hindu heaven instead of life in the Muslim paradise, of splendidorous Gardens, fine garments and fruits, and magnificent companions).

(As noted above, the Swami quotes the Mundak Upanishad, III, 2, 6, as saying that the soul, after enjoy-ing its emancipation “is again born into this world.” **But this teaching is not of the Vedas.** If there was such a teaching in the Vedas it is reasonable that the Swami would have used it for his quote, rather than using the Mundak Upanishad. Also whereas the Mundak says that the soul, after its emancipation “is again born into this world,” it is said that “All other writers teach and all the world believes that the *Emancipation* is that condition from which **no soul returns to this world** and becomes subject to births and deaths.” (p. 285). However the Swami disagrees with this view, and gave arguments to support the Mundak Upanishad. But the Swami’s submission is irrelevant. **If the Vedas were clear on this issue it is hardly likely that there would be an opposing view.** (Italics/emphasis added).

The Swami says (LOT, pp. 408-409): “When the verse which forms the basis of the book is meaningless, why would not the whole book be the same?”

Likewise, as there are no clear expressions in the Veda(s) for the doctrines of *karma* and *reincarnation* and as there is controversy as to the emancipated soul returning to take birth again or not and disagreement between the soul taking births in every

kingdom of life or only in its own kingdom, then according to the Swami's reasoning, the whole Vedic religion is "meaning-less."

The Islamic Articles of Faith are clearly expressed in the Qur'an.

Swami Dayananda Saraswati, "the illustrious founder of the Arya Samaj", as the Publisher describes him, says: "It does not become wise men to mislead people."

"We lay this criticism on the teachings of the Quran before all thinking people. Let them decide for themselves as to what sort of book it is. As for our opinion, we think that this book can neither be the work of God nor that of an enlightened person, nor does it contain knowledge. We have pointed out some of its many faults so that people may not be taken in and thereby waste their lives."

"If all enlightened men were, like us, to point out, in an impartial spirit, various defects found in different religions, it is not at all impossible that all quarrels should cease, that people should live together in peace all following one religion, and that truth should thus triumph. The wise and the good, it is hoped, will understand the motives which actuated the writer of these lines and profit by what little has been said here about the Quran. They are requested to correct any mistakes that might have crept into the book through error of judgment." (LOT, pp. i, vii; 719-720, respectively).

In the preceding, mistakes by the Swami have not only been 'corrected', it is also shown that the basis of Hinduism/Vedism—*karma and reincarnation*—are not only "strange" and "very obscure" teachings but that there is a difference in belief that man is reincarnated into various kingdoms or only as one type of creature and that the methods of one freeing himself from this cycle of deaths and rebirths "differ from school to school."

If karma and reincarnation were clearly expressed doctrines in the Veda(s), it would be expected that there should be no difference between the various schools of Hinduism, as to the type of creatures one is reincarnated into and as to the method(s) that frees the soul from the cycle of deaths and rebirths. They should be the same.

In believing that his suffering is the result of his actions in a past life, man "is thus induced to reconcile himself to social cruelty, exploitation and oppression," wrote V.M. Tarkunde. (*Radical Humanism*, p. 69).

If suffering is the result of karma, no attempt should be made to alleviate the miserable conditions of the sufferers and the poor. If their conditions can be improved, karma is meaningless —seeing that it can be subverted. If karma can be annulled, man can change the natural law of God. If man can change the natural law of God, man would be greater than God. But man could never be greater than God.

In Islam man does not have to suffer the body for the "salvation of the soul." He does not have to "free" himself from this world. This world is not bondage for man. Allāh, God, sent man with a pristine nature into this world with the capability of conquering all other creations.

Whereas Allāh, God, gives man guidance, man makes his own future. The moral map charted by Allāh, God, is no "compul-sion" to man, but for man to shape himself to have mutual respect for what is his and what belongs to others; and to bestow good to others as he would have others bestow good unto him.

*

Summary: Hinduism where God is merciless –as *karma* is said to give to every action an equal and opposite reaction, and unerringly award us exactly what we deserve–; where there is division as to whether Krishna, Rama, and Hanuman are Gods or not, whether creatures are reincarnated into various kingdoms or as one type only, and whether God incarnates as humans or not; whose doctrine of *reincarnation* is “very obscure”; which follow books that are “mythological;” where the Gita is “opposed” to the Veda; whose Rig Veda is composed (at least in part) by “bard-priest;” where there is difference as to whether everything is created by God or not –**that soul is “eternal” and the universe (matter) is “self-creating, self-dissolving, self-manifesting”**–; whether the soul returns to earth or not after its Emancipation; that teaches a mix of Monotheism, monism, deism, dualism, and polytheism; where the God (Vishnu) grows in status –**from being a “minor solar deity”**–; where worship is made to Vishnu, Krishna, Shiva, and *grama-devatas*; where there are differences in the attainment of Moksha/Emancipation; where man’s destiny as influenced by the planets is either fact or “fraud;” where the ‘*misconducting*’ wife is fed to dogs and the adulterer is burned to death; where woman is of lower birth; and where adherents are ‘caste-sied’ according to birth– **the religion of such conflicting doctrines and beliefs, and discrimination could not be the religion for “enlightened” mankind.**

The Islamic Articles of Faith –Unity of God, Prayer, Charity, Fasting and Hajj– Resurrection, Judgment, Paradise and Hell are clearly expressed in the Qur'an.

Fourteen hundred years ago, Islam put an end to the God incarnate(s) and the medley of Gods; it impelled man to elevate himself above the irrationality of polytheism and the degradation and futility of idolatry and inspired chronic idolaters to entomb their artifacts of stone. **This** religion –Islam– **is** the only religion for “enlightened” mankind.

Allah, Lord of the worlds,
Glory be to Thee, Allah!

*